PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

605093

REPORTS

FROM

COMMITTEES:

SIXTEEN VOLUMES.

—

—*(4.—Part I.)*—

EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Session

31 *January* —— 17 *July* 1837.

VOL. VIII.—Part I.

1837.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

1837.

SIXTEEN VOLUMES:—CONTENTS OF THE

FOURTH VOLUME, PART I.

N. B.—*THE* Figures *at the* beginning of the line, *correspond with the* N° *at the foot of each* Report; *and the* Figures *at the* end of the line, *refer to the* MS. Paging *of the Volumes arranged for The House of Commons.*

EDUCATION (IRELAND):

543.—I. REPORT from the SELECT COMMITTEE of the HOUSE OF LORDS on the PLAN of EDUCATION in *Ireland*; with MINUTES of EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - p. 1

EDUCATION (IRELAND):

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. 3

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - 5

REPORT

(Brought from the Lords, 17 July 1837)

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

NEW PLAN OF EDUCATION

IN IRELAND;

TOGETHER WITH

THE MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AN APPENDIX AND INDEX.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
17 *July* 1837.

543.—I.

PART I.	THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - -	p. iii
	MINUTES OF EVIDENCE from the 3d March to the 22d May 1837	p. 3 to p. 743
PART II.	MINUTES OF EVIDENCE from the 23d May to the 14th July 1837	p. 745 to p. 1404
	APPENDIX - - - - - - - - -	p. 1405 to p. 1429
	INDEX - - - - - - - - - -	p. 1431 to p. 1491

REPORT.

BY THE LORDS COMMITTEES appointed a SELECT COMMITTEE to inquire into the PROGRESS and OPERATION of the NEW PLAN OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND, and to report to the House; and to whom Leave was also given to report from Time to Time to the House; and to whom were also referred several Petitions and Papers in relation to the Inquiry before the Committee:—

ORDERED TO REPORT,

THAT the Committee have, in pursuance of the Order of the House, proceeded diligently to examine into the Matters referred to them. In the Execution of this Duty they have thought it indispensable to examine Persons of almost every Variety of Opinion and of different Religious Persuasions, and the number of Persons whose Evidence has been suggested to them as important, together with the Length to which the Examination of some particular Witnesses has extended, has been so great as to preclude their bringing the Inquiry so satisfactorily to a Close as to make it possible at this Season to lay before the House a detailed Report of the Opinions they have formed upon a Subject, the Consideration of which would necessarily divide itself into many Branches.

RATHER, therefore, than do Injustice to so important a Subject by any partial or imperfect Observations, the Committee prefer submitting to the House, without further Comment, the whole of the Evidence they have collected, trusting that it will furnish the House with ample Materials for Information, and enable them to form a Judgment upon a Question of incalculable Importance to the Welfare and Tranquillity of Society in Ireland, from its Connexion with the Habits and Pursuits of a greatly increased Population.

AND the Committee have directed the MINUTES of EVIDENCE taken before the Committee, together with an APPENDIX and INDEX thereto, to be reported to the House.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE

PROGRESS AND OPERATION

OF THE

NEW PLAN OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND;

AND TO REPORT THEREUPON TO THE HOUSE.

1837.

Part I.

Evidence taken from 3d March to 22d May.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

PART I.

Die Veneris, 3° *Martii* 1837.

The Reverend James Carlile - page 3

Die Lunæ, 6° *Martii* 1837.

The Reverend James Carlile - - 27

Die Martis, 7° *Martii* 1837.

The Right Hon. Anthony R. Blake - 53

Die Jovis, 9° *Martii* 1837.

The Right Hon. Anthony R. Blake - 73

Die Lunæ, 13° *Martii* 1837.

Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 93

The Reverend Norman M'Leod, D.D. - 106

Die Jovis, 16° *Martii* 1837.

The Reverend James Graham - - 121

Die Veneris, 17° *Martii* 1837.

Charles William Hamilton, Esquire - 151
The Reverend John Brown - - 162

Die Lunæ, 20° *Martii* 1837.

The Reverend John Brown - - 179

Die Martis, 21° *Martii* 1837.

The Reverend Hugh Walker Rogers - 207
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 223

Die Jovis, 6° *Aprilis* 1837.

Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 239

Die Veneris, 7° *Aprilis* 1837.

The Reverend Francis Blake Woodward 259
The Reverend William Maturin - - 280

Die Lunæ, 10° *Aprilis* 1837.

The Reverend Francis Blake Woodward 285
Alexander M'Arthur, M.D. - - - 285

Die Martis, 11° *Aprilis* 1837.

John Price, Esquire - - - - 311
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 317
John Price, Esquire - - - - 322
John Colquhoun, Esquire - - - 330

Die Veneris, 14° *Aprilis* 1837.

Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 339
John Price, Esquire - - - - 342
The Reverend Mark Perrin - - 347
William Richard Yeilding, Esquire - 355

Die Lunæ, 17° *Aprilis* 1837.

William Richard Yeilding, Esquire - 367
The Reverend Mark Perrin - - 368
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 372
The Reverend Edward Nangle - - 378

Die Martis, 18° *Aprilis* 1837.

The Reverend Edward Nangle - page 397
Lieutenant Joseph Irwin, R.N. - - 412
Timothy M'Carthy - - - - 419

Die Veneris, 21° *Aprilis* 1837.

James Dombrain, Esquire - - - 423
Charles Bridger - - - - 426
Thomas Ralph - - - - - 433
Thomas M'Nulty - - - - 439
Mr. Francis Reynolds - - - 443
John Rutledge - - - - - 445
Mr. James Kelly - - - - 447

Die Lunæ, 24° *Aprilis* 1837.

Mr. James Kelly - - - - 453
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 465

Die Martis, 25° *Aprilis* 1837.

Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 477
Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - - 481
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 484
Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - - 486

Die Veneris, 28° *Aprilis* 1837.

Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 489
Colonel William Warre - - - 499
Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - - 503

Die Lunæ, 1° *Maii* 1837.

Colonel William Warre - - - 515
Mr. Henry Malcomson - - - 516
Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - 524
Mr. Daniel Murray - - - - 528
Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - 534

Die Martis, 2° *Maii* 1837.

Mr. Thomas Harris Carroll - - 543
John Colquhoun, Esquire - - - 552

Die Jovis, 4° *Maii* 1837.

The Rev. Charles R. Elrington, D.D. - 573

Die Lunæ, 8° *Maii* 1837.

The Rev. Charles R. Elrington, D.D. - 601
Mr. Lewis Mills - - - - 617

Die Martis, 9° *Maii* 1837.

Mr. Lewis Mills - - - - 627
Thomas F. Kelly, Esquire - - - 651

Die Veneris, 12° *Maii* 1837.

Thomas Finn, LL.D. - - - - 657

Die Veneris, 19° *Maii* 1837.

Robert Sullivan, M.A. - - - 681

Die Lunæ, 22° *Maii* 1837.

Mr. Thomas Jaffray Robertson - - 713
The Reverend Robert Bell - - - 731

Die Veneris, 3° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Reverend JAMES CARLILE is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Minister of the Presbyterian Persuasion?
I am.

You are one of the Board of Commissioners appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to administer and superintend the Parliamentary Grants for the general Education of Ireland?
I am.

Have you constantly attended the Meetings of that Board?
Almost constantly.

Are you generally resident in Dublin?
Yes.

You are in fact the Resident Commissioner?
Yes; in consequence of my giving considerably more Attention than the other Commissioners can do, I have Apartments in the House.

Have you had the greatest Share in conducting the Details of the Measure?
I have.

Have the goodness to state the Course you have pursued from the Beginning, and the Progress the System has made in the various Provinces of Ireland?
Almost immediately after we had accepted the Commission, we were requested by Lord Stanley, who was then Chief Secretary, to open our Board for Applications for Assistance; we accordingly did so, and Applications from different Parts of the Kingdom came in with considerable Rapidity, which were taken into Consideration as we might be able to do so, and Grants were made accordingly. The Number of Schools has been increasing from Year to Year till it has come up to the Number stated in our last Report. I forget precisely the Number. We have in Operation at present 1,181 Schools. The Number of Schools besides those that are in Operation does not appear to be stated in the last Report, and I cannot precisely state it; but from 1,400 to 1,500 is the whole Number to which we have either promised or given Assistance.

In which Province is the greater Number of Schools established?
Considerably the greater Number in the Province of Ulster.

In which Province the next?
The next Leinster, the next Munster, and Connaught the last.

Has the System been supported by Protestants as well as by Roman Catholics?
To a very considerable Extent it has.

What is the Proportion of Protestant Children and Roman Catholic Children educated in the Schools?
There was a Return called for on the Part of the House of Lords to that Question, but the Board considered they were not authorized to institute a public Inquiry to answer that Question. I have however myself, as Resident Commissioner, requested the Inspectors to ask the Schoolmasters in their Districts what the Proportion of Roman Catholic and Protestant Children in the Schools they inspected was, and the Result has been that there are upwards of 14,000 Protestant Children in Ulster actually returned, and taking the Proportion of Sixty-six

Rev. J. Carlile.

Schools that were not reported upon, the Reports having come in previously to my having made the Request to the Inspectors, that makes, according to the Computation, upwards of 16,743 Protestant Children in Ulster, and 27,905 Roman Catholics. The Number of Protestant Children in the other Provinces is comparatively very small indeed. I have Documents upon which I can give more precise Answers upon that Point, if your Lordships desire it.

Can you state the Proportion in the other Provinces?

The Proportion of the whole is as Five to Two of Roman Catholic Children to Protestant Children; Five Catholics to Two Protestants, taking the whole Kingdom.

Can you state how it is in each Province?

Yes, I can. The Numbers, as I have said, in the other Provinces besides Ulster, are very small. In Leinster the whole Number of Children on the Rolls of the Schools reported is 43,843, of which 35,318 are reported to be Roman Catholics, and 702 Protestants. In Ulster the gross Numbers on the Rolls of the Schools reported are 46,528; of these 14,627 are reported to be Protestants, and 22,337 Roman Catholics. Some of the Inspectors reported the Proportions of Children present at the time of Inspection, and others of them reported the Proportions of the Children on the Roll. The gross Number of Children on the Roll is usually much greater than the Number of Children present at any given time, and that prevents the Number of Children reported to be Roman Catholic or Protestant being the same as the Number reported on the Rolls of the Schools.

Have you got a Return of all the Children on the Rolls separated into Roman Catholic and Protestant, or of all the Children in Attendance separated into Roman Catholic and Protestant?

I cannot say that I have got regularly a Return of any thing. I requested the Inspectors to state the Numbers, but that was not until after they had proceeded for some Time with their Inspection. I requested the Inspectors throughout the Kingdom to ask the Schoolmasters, without turning out the Children or taking any public Notice of the Inquiry, to state the Number of Roman Catholic and of Protestant Children. The Inspectors make a Return at all Times regularly of the Children upon the Roll; some of them misunderstood the Directions, and did not return the Proportions on the Rolls, but the Proportion of Roman Catholic and Protestant Children actually present; some omitted occasionally to answer my Question. These Numbers I took from the Inspectors' Returns with my own Hand; but the Number of Children upon the Roll will of course be likely to be considerably larger than the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children reported as actually present. The Number of Children upon which they gave Reports as to the distinct Religions were 14,627 Protestants and 22,337 Roman Catholics; not however intending to say that those constituted all the Children upon the Roll, some being omitted, as I have already stated.

It is evident from what you have stated that the System has been much more sanctioned and acted upon in Ulster than in the other Provinces of Ireland?

Yes, in respect to the combined Education.

Have the goodness to state the Numbers in the other Provinces?

In Leinster 43,843 upon the Roll; the Number of Protestants reported 702; the Number of Roman Catholics reported 35,318. In Munster 25,194 upon the Roll; 154 Protestants and 19,108 Roman Catholics. In Connaught the Number upon the Roll 16,147; the Number of Protestants 277, and the Number of Roman Catholics 14,186. Those do not include the whole of the Children in the Schools, from the Circumstance I have stated, that there are a considerable Number of Schools not reported on. These Schools reported have 131,712 Children upon the Rolls; 15,760 Protestants and 90,949 Roman Catholics.

The latter is the Attendance, and the other is the Roll?

Not exactly so; the greater Part of them are the Proportions on the Roll; there are some that give the Proportions only of those who were present at the Inspection.

The

Rev. J. Carlile.

The Deficiency is in those particular Schools where the Inspectors have only reported with respect to the Children present, which makes the Difference between the Two Amounts?

Yes; the Proportions of Roman Catholics and Protestants in the greater Part of the Schools are the Proportions of the Children upon the Rolls, but in some the Inspector reported merely the Proportions of Children in attendance; the Consequence is, that when the Number of Children reported to be Protestant and Roman Catholic are added together there is a Discrepancy between that Number and the Number of Children reported to be on the School Rolls.

There is a Confusion from this not being accurately made up?

There is a Discrepancy in consequence of the Proportions not being taken, as it would have been, accurately, had it been done by Directions of the Board.

How many Inspectors are there?

Eight.

When did you express a Request to the Inspectors to take that Account?

I think in the Month of March last Year.

When you speak of the Children in attendance, you mean on the particular Day when the Inspector visited the School?

Yes.

That was subsequent to your receiving the Order of the House of Lords requiring the Number to be returned, which you did not choose to obey?

That Order was of the previous Year.

In what Year was the Number taken?

Last Year, from the Month of March; it has been going on till very recently.

Are the Committee to understand that the Order of the House of Lords was not complied with?

The Order of the House never was complied with; it could not be. There was a Representation made by the Commissioners that they considered it contrary to the Spirit of their Instructions to institute such an Inquiry by the Board.

This Account depends upon the Authority of the Schoolmaster?

Yes; the Schoolmaster and the Inspector.

Have you any Doubt of its Accuracy?

I have no Doubt it gives a very fair View of the Proportions of the Children of the different Religious Persuasions.

You are not aware of any thing that would make it the Interest of the Schoolmaster to make a Representation different from the Truth?

Nothing whatever.

What do you consider to be the Cause of the different Result in Ulster from that in other Provinces?

One Cause, and the chief, no Doubt, is, that the only Province in the Kingdom in which there is any considerable Number of poor Protestants is Ulster.

Has the System been more sanctioned by the Protestant Clergy in Ulster than in any of the other Provinces of Ireland?

There is Information upon that Subject in the Appendix to the Report: there is a List of all the Protestant Clergy who countenance it. I have however to observe, that the Number of Protestant Clergy (by which I mean Presbyterian Clergy as well as of the Church of England) mentioned in the Report, either as Applicants or in any way connected with the Schools, does not give an exactly fair View of the Protestant Clergymen that are favourably disposed to the Board, and give Assistance in the Promotion of the System of Education. There has been a very violent Opposition in the Province of Ulster, and the Consequence is, many have written to me, at different Times, stating that they were favourably disposed to the System, but that they did not apply because they did not wish to subject themselves to any Unpleasant-

Rev. J. Carlile.

ness with their Congregations by applying to the Board, but that the Schools would be taken care of and superintended by the Laymen of their Congregations; and some Individuals who had given their Names have withdrawn them on finding that the Names of those in correspondence with the Board were to be returned to Parliament, stating that they had no Objection to continue to superintend the Schools as formerly. The Number of Lay Correspondents in Ulster is greater than in any other Province, and the Number of Clerical Correspondents in the other Provinces is greater than in Ulster.

Do you know any other Reason which should make the System, so far as it contemplates combined Education, more successful in Ulster than in the other Provinces, besides the greater Equality of the Numbers of the different Religious Persuasions?

No, I do not know of any other Reason.

What Degree of Countenance does the System receive from the Roman Catholic and Protestant Gentry of Ireland respectively?

It is difficult to find Data on which to answer that Question. A very considerable Proportion of the Peerage of Ireland who have Estates there are in one Form or other connected with the System, as by giving Land or making Applications. I should say there are more in Number of Protestant Gentry in connexion with us than of Roman Catholic Gentry; but that must be taken in connexion with the Fact that there is a smaller Number of Roman Catholic Gentry in Ireland.

Is any Assistance given to the Erection of Schools on Ground appertaining to Roman Catholic Chapels?

There has been Aid given to the building of Schools on Ground connected with Roman Catholic Chapels.

For what Reason has that been done?

We have always required on the Erection of a new School that the Applicants should endeavour to get Ground elsewhere before we have consented to make Grants for Schools so situated; and the Reasons for having made Grants for Schools on Ground attached to Roman Catholic Chapels have been various. There were some Schools that were commenced to be built previously to the Establishment of the Board, and which had been proceeded with to a considerable Extent at an Expense to the People; and One Reason why we granted them Aid in the finishing of those Schools was, that it seemed very hard that the People, after having partly built a School-house, should be applied to for another Subscription as their Contribution towards the building of a new School-house; that was One Reason.

Those Schools so circumstanced were solely Roman Catholic Schools?

They were to be National Schools when they came under us; they were not Schools at all then.

Were they in the Inclosure of the Chapel?

Yes, they were, in some Instances; but then we always required there should be Access to the open Road.

You made the Grant on the Condition that they should be Schools on the National System?

Of course. Another Reason, and a very prevalent Reason, was, that the Applicants could find no Ground elsewhere; sometimes not at all; sometimes not without paying an extravagant Price or Rent for it.

Did you ever require from them any Reasons to satisfy your Minds that they could not, on Application, get Ground elsewhere?

We did. Very frequently we had a Letter or Note from the Landlord, or the Landlord's Agent, addressed to them, refusing them Ground; in other Cases there was Evidence of a different Description; but we were always satisfied that they could not get suitable Ground elsewhere, at least on reasonable Terms; and of late we also required the Inspector's Report upon the Subject before we made Grants. In the first instance, when we were obliged to receive the Applications upon the Spur almost of the Moment, it was impossible to get Inspectors Reports, and we could not be so cautious as we have been since we have had it in our Power to institute a careful Examination.

How

How long did that Period you referred to, when you had not Inspectors Reports, last?

I cannot say; but we became gradually more and more strict as we obtained Means and Agency and Experience.

Have any Applications been made for Grants to Schools on Land connected with the Protestant Church, either Glebe or Churchyard?

I really cannot exactly reply to that Question. I do not remember. I have a very bad Memory for Details.

You remember that Applications have been made for Grants to Schools on Land connected with Roman Catholic Chapels?

That has been so frequently impressed on my Memory, I could not help remembering that. I know that we have some Schools in the Neighbourhood of Protestant Churches, particularly Presbyterian, but whether Grants were made for building them I cannot say; I should rather think not. I rather think those built by Protestants were on Ground entirely neutral; not at all connected with any Place of Worship.

You mentioned that there were Cases in which the Landlords or Agents had refused Grants of Land?

There were many such Cases.

Do you recollect the Ground on which they refused?

Various Grounds; some said they did not approve of the System, and therefore could not grant Ground for it.

Do you happen to know of any National School held in a Protestant Cathedral?

I do; in the Buildings forming Part of the Cathedral the Protestant School at Killaloe is held.

Are there Two Schools?

There are Two Schools, for Male and Female Children, which I inspected myself at the End of last Year.

Are the Scripture Extracts read in that School?

I believe so; I found them there, and examined the Children upon them. I have no Doubt of their being regularly read.

Did you hear, on your Inspection of that School, that any Objection was taken, either by Protestants or Roman Catholics, to Attendance in it?

I heard of no such Objection. The Priest of the Parish accompanied me to the Schools; and I believe, but I have not the same Ground for knowing, that the Protestant Clergy were also favourable to them.

Did you hear that any Roman Catholic Children of the Lower Orders stayed away in consequence of any thing connected with the Education in that School?

Certainly not; I heard of no such thing.

How is that School supported?

I can only answer for the Grant given by the Board.

Do you happen to know that a great Proportion of the Salaries is paid by a Protestant Clergyman?

I have heard so.

Do you happen to know whether a Protestant Clergyman of the Cathedral was in frequent Attendance at the School?

No, I do not recollect hearing that.

Do you know the Religion of the Master and Mistress of that School?

I dare not trust my Memory with an Answer to that Question.

Of course it could be easily ascertained who is the Correspondent with the Board for that School?

Certainly.

And who applied for that School to be put on the Board?

Certainly; that can be ascertained without any Difficulty.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Was not it the present Bishop of Derry who applied?
I think it was.

Was that School patronized by all the successive Bishops of Killaloe?
I cannot answer that Question.

The School has gone on uniformly?
I can only answer for the Bishop of Derry and the present Bishop of Killaloe.

There have been Four successive Bishops of that Diocese in the Time?
I do not recollect that Circumstance.

With respect to the Funds for the Maintenance of that School, you know of no others but those you have mentioned?
I cannot answer as to the others.

But there must be other Funds?
Certainly.

Are you in the habit of granting Funds for Schools where there are not local Subscriptions?
We are not in the habit of granting Funds for the repairing or building unless there are local Subscriptions; but we grant Salaries where we are not aware of there being any local Subscriptions.

Is that School held in the Vestry of the Cathedral?
I am not perhaps so much acquainted with the Parts of a Cathedral as to say whether it be the Vestry or not, but it is a Part of the Cathedral entering at the great Door turning off to the Left.

Did the Roman Catholic Clergyman make any Objection to the Locality of that School?
No; he said he had no Objection to it, at the same Time that he thought it would be better for the Parish that it should be elsewhere.

Did he show any Jealousy at its being held in that Place?
None whatever.

Did the Roman Catholic Clergyman make any Objection to the Roman Catholic Children attending a School under the Roof of the Cathedral?
He did not; he stated that he himself had no Objection, but that for the Parish he thought it would be better if it were elsewhere.

Can you state the Number of Roman Catholic and Protestant Children attending that School?
I cannot at the present Moment. That was one of the Reports given in previously to my making the Request to the Inspectors to return their Numbers.

How is the System going on at present; are there many fresh Applications making?
There are to the Amount of 400 and upwards Applications for new Schools upon the Books, and have been for the last Year or two. In consequence of our not having been able to take on new Schools there are but few Applications coming in; but we have the Number which I have mentioned before the Board. In consequence of the limited Funds we have had at our Disposal we have not been able to receive new Schools to any Extent for the last Two Years.

The Fact then is, the Applications have not increased lately?
The Applications have not increased lately in consequence of our not having Funds to answer them.

You conceive very naturally if the Funds were increased the Applications would be increased in Number?
I have no Doubt if we could comply with the 400 Applications we have those would be very soon replaced by others.

Do you conceive the Applications would be such as to afford a Prospect of the System being extended throughout the Kingdom?
I have no Doubt of it.

Are those Applications made by Protestant or Roman Catholic Clergymen?
There are not many by Protestant Clergy; there are a good many by Protestant Laymen.

How many are there by Protestant Laymen?
I cannot answer that Question, but I have no Doubt the Proportion is about the same as the Proportion in the Schools already in connexion with us.

Can you make a Return of the Number of each?
We can state the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Applications; but I have not the Books here.

With respect to the Numbers of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children that you mentioned, all those Calculations are founded upon the Roll kept in the School?
Yes; the School Roll.

In what Year did those Rolls first commence?
All the various Years we have been in existence; but there is a Rule of the Board by which every Half Year they are renewed, and no Children are continued upon the School Roll that have not been in attendance during some Part of the Half Year for which the Roll is given.

The Number might appear much larger if the Roll was continued from the opening of the School?
Yes; we were aware of that possible Fallacy, therefore we required the Names of the Children to be sent up every Half Year; there are none sent up but of those who have been in attendance during some Part of the Half Year.

The Name of the County in which the School is situated is not stated in the Return made to this House?
Perhaps it was not asked; we have them in Counties in other Reports.

A Memorandum is kept of all Applications, under the Heads of No. 1., No. 2., and No. 3., is it not?
Yes.

By No. 1. Applications meaning those the Commissioners were required to give the Preference to, namely, those signed by Protestant and Roman Catholic Clergymen, No. 2. by the Clergy of one Denomination and Laymen of another, and No. 3. those which have no Clergyman concurring in them?
Yes.

Can you procure for the Committee a Memorandum of the different Classes?
I can. That Return would be defective in One Particular; No. 2. would not distinguish the Roman Catholic and Protestant.

Still you would be able in No. 2. to say whether it was a Protestant Clergyman or a Roman Catholic Clergyman who had applied?
We could by examining every individual Application.

Do you recollect whether Complaints have been made and Impatience manifested in many Instances by those Persons whose Applications have been delayed and left unanswered for nearly a Twelvemonth?
There have been very many exceedingly urgent and exceedingly distressing Complaints. Ever since I came to London there has been a very urgent Complaint, threatening that the Applicants would lay the Case before this Committee if it was not answered and attended to immediately.

From what Part of Ireland is that?
I cannot recollect at this Moment.

You can refer to it?
Yes, certainly.

Shall you be able to state from what Parts of the Country those Applications have come?
Yes, certainly.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Have there been as many from Connaught as from Ulster?
No; I think most from Ulster.

The People of Ulster seem to be very anxious to derive Benefit from the Board?
Many of them are.

Is there any Opposition to the System on the Part of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland?
I have not found any Opposition from them.

Not in the Province of Connaught, where there are fewer Applications made?
No.

You do not attribute the small Number of Applications to that Reason?
No; I think the small Number of Applications is owing to the Poverty of the People, who cannot contribute the One Third to the Expense of building of Schoolrooms; we have had repeated Intimations that that has prevented the Establishment of the Schools in many of the poorer Parts of the Country; that they cannot collect the One Third of the Expense of the building which is required by the Board.

You stated that some of the Clergy of the Established Church, as well as the Presbyterians, were favourable to the System; but from feeling that there was an Objection on the Part of their Congregations that they had not applied?
I would not say on the Part of their Congregations, but that there were some who, from prudential Reasons of different Kinds, did so.

You stated that there was Opposition in Congregations?
Yes; I referred principally to the Presbyterians in that Statement; I used the Word "Protestants" applying to both.

What was your Impression as to the Cause of the Objection of Clergymen of the Establishment to the Board?
I think there are some in consequence of the Bishops being unfavourably disposed to the Board.

Did they state that in their Letters to you?
The Impression upon my Mind is, that, either in Letters or Conversation, such Statements were made.

That would refer to the Clergy of the Established Church; not of the Presbyterian?
Yes.

That is the only Objection you can recollect?
That is the only one I recollect from them.

Do you state that with Certainty?
No, not with absolute Certainty, but that is the Impression upon my Mind.

Did you hear of any Threat being held out that the Congregations would not attend on any Minister who gave a Recommendation to the School?
There were Threats of that Description to Presbyterian Ministers, I think, in more than One Instance.

From whom did those Threats proceed?
Either from the Members of the Congregation or People living in the immediate Neighbourhood of the Congregation that had it in their Power to excite Disturbance.

Did you hear of any Resolution entered into by a Meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge, that if any Clergyman adhered to the National System, or gave in his Assent to it, his Congregation should not attend him?
I did hear of that, but I cannot state upon what Evidence.

In your Answers to the last Questions you have referred principally to the Presbyterians?
Chiefly to the Presbyterians.

Is it the Impression upon your Mind that the Clergy of the Established Church were in any Instances prevented from making Application to the Board by any Threats or Objections on the Part of their Congregations?
I do not recollect any Instance of that Kind.

You confine this entirely to Presbyterians?
Yes, to Presbyterians, as to their being deterred by that particular Reason.

What Religious Works has the Board published for the Use of the Schools?
There is a good deal connected with Religion in all our Books, such as the Summaries of Scripture History in our Reading Books; but the Books chiefly of a Religious Character which have been published by the Board are Four small Volumes of Extracts from the Sacred Scriptures.

Are any more of those in progress?
Three are in contemplation, but I am sorry to say not yet in progress; the Fourth has been very recently published, and we have not yet had Time to proceed to the Fifth.

Have the Scripture Extracts been much objected to?
They have been objected to considerably on the Part of many Protestants.

On what Ground?
Really I am hardly able to specify all the Grounds of Objection; but they have been objected to on the Ground that the Translation is unfair, and favourable to the Roman Catholic Religion; that I think is the chief Ground; on the Ground also of their being Extracts at all; also on the Ground that they are a Mutilation of the Word of God.

Are they in general Use in the Schools?
They are not used in absolutely all the Schools, but they are in very general Use. I have Returns upon that Subject from which I can state to the Committee the Extent to which the Scripture Extracts are used. Of 1,051 Schools reported upon, the Scripture Extracts are used in 839 Schools. The Number of Children present in these Schools at the Time of Inspection was 62,946; of these there were 15,371 Children, that is, about One Fourth Part of the Number present, employed in reading the Scripture Extracts. These Extracts therefore are read in Schools containing 131,712 Children.

The Number actually reading the Extracts was at the Time that the Inspector visited the School?
Yes. When he happened to visit he was directed to take the Numbers who were reading the Extracts, and by adding up it makes the Number of Children present 62,946; of whom 15,371, or nearly One Fourth Part, were reading those Extracts.

You say when the Inspector happened to visit; are there any stated Times for his visiting the Schools?
He is employed almost the whole Year; there is no particular Time for his visiting each School.

Is there any Time appointed for his Visit to a School?
No. We do every thing in our Power to prevent its being known when he is to visit a School.

It is soon known in a Province or District when an Inspector arrives, is it not?
It is, surprisingly so.

Did he state whether he found those Books much used or not?
I do not recollect that the Inspectors have stated that, but I can state from my own Inspection, having visited Seventy-five Schools in Six different Counties, towards the South and West of Ireland, last Year, and having examined particularly that Point, I found, in many of them, the Scripture Extracts having the Appearance of being very much used, and I examined the Children upon them, and found them in Possession of a very considerable Portion of Scriptural Knowledge derived from them.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Your Impression was that those Scripture Extracts were very much read?
My Impression was that they were so to an Extent very far beyond what I expected when I went on the Inspection.

Is there any Authority exercised by the Board on the Books used in separate Religious Instruction?
None whatever by the Board. According to the original Letter of Instruction given to us, the Books used in Religious Instruction were to be reported to any Member of the Board of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whom the Books were intended. That Rule was subsequently modified in consequence of a Misunderstanding having arisen, and it was explained that neither the Government nor the Members of the Board claimed any Control over the Standard Works of any Church. A Return was called for in the House of Lords which contained the Names of the Books which were so used, but these were not Books which were sanctioned by the Board, but what were considered as Standard Books in the different Churches.

Is a Return made to a particular Member of the Board of all Works employed in the separate Religious Instruction of the Children, other than those which are the Standard Works of the respective Churches?
I believe there has never been a Return made to any Member of the Board upon the Subject. I can only speak for myself; but I have learned that the same is the Fact with respect to Dr. Murray and the Archbishop of Dublin.

That original Order has not been acted upon?
It has not been acted on by the People; they have had no Reason to use any Books in the separate Religious Instruction but the Standard Books.

The Works employed by the Presbyterians in the Instruction of their Children would naturally be reported to you if that were done?
Yes.

None have been reported to you?
No.

Will you have the goodness to read the Heading, Return, 11th July 1832, to the List contained in the Return to this House, now shown to you?
"Lists of all Books or Tracts employed in the Schools in the separate Religious Instruction, with the Sanction or Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended."

Are there not under that Head Books returned for the Roman Catholic Children?
Certainly; I believe the Books returned to be the Standard Books of the Church of Rome.

Are there not many that do not profess to be of that Kind?
I do not know. That List was given, I understand, by Dr. Murray to the Secretary, as containing the Standard Books of that Church employed for Education.

Will you have the goodness to read the Answer given to the Order?
"Lists of all Books or Tracts employed in the Schools in the separate Religious Instruction, with the Sanction or Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended. For the Protestant Children: Bible, authorized Version; New Testament, Ditto; Church Catechism; the Church Liturgy; Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland; larger and shorter Catechisms of same Church. For the Roman Catholic Children: the Douay Testament; Reeves's History of Old and New Testament; Gahan's Ditto Ditto; Morality of the Bible; Gother on the Epistles and Gospels; Dr. Doyle's Catechism; Reily's Catechism; Catholic Christian instructed; Butler's General Catechism; Fleurry's Historical Catechism; Gobbonet's Instructions to Youth; Think well on it; Chaloner's Meditations; Imitation of Christ."

All those are employed by the Sanction and Approbation of the Members of the Board. It is distinctly said, that for the Standard Books they consider no Sanction or Approbation as necessary; that they do not consider themselves

at

Rev. J. Carlile.

at liberty to deal with the Standards of different Churches; but that the other Books which are not Standards cannot be used without the Sanction and Approbation of a Member of the Board?

The Date of that Return is the 11th of July 1832. I am not quite certain at what Time it was that the Explanation was given that no Control was to be exercised over the Standard Books; there was an Explanation, in consequence of Sentiments expressed by Members of the Synod of Ulster upon this Subject.

Is there any thing in the Rules of the Board which prevents or prohibits reading the whole of the Scriptures in School Hours?

I conceive nothing whatever. There has been a good deal of Discussion respecting what is meant by School Hours. Conductors of Schools may call the Hours for Scripture reading School Hours or not, as they think fit. I remember an important Letter of Lord Stanley explaining what he meant by School Hours. But the Hour for Scripture reading must be the first or the last Hour, not an intermediate Hour, as that would oblige the Children who object to the Exercise to go out of the School while the Scriptures are read, and return again when the reading was over. We considered it not right that Roman Catholic Children should be subjected to such Annoyance, and we required that the Scripture reading should be either the first or the last Hour. A Case requiring such a Precaution happened with respect to a few Protestant Children in the South. It was found that some Form of Roman Catholic Instruction was given at Twelve o'Clock, and that the Protestant Children were allowed to remain or go out, as they thought fit. We directed that such Instruction must be in the first or the last Hour; that the Protestant Children should not be subjected to that Annoyance of being obliged to go out and wait while that Instruction was given. Our Rule therefore is, that Conductors of Schools may call the Hour for Religious Instruction School Hour or not, as they think fit, but it must be the first or the last Hour of the Attendance in the School.

Are the Scriptures read in all the Schools at the Time the Children are all collected together, both Roman Catholic and Protestant?

I believe in the Province of Ulster there are many Schools in which they are so read; but I do not know it officially.

Your Rules do not absolutely forbid the reading of the whole Bible in the Schools in School Hours?

Certainly not, with the Explanation of School Hours that I have given.

Have the goodness to give that again?

That we do not insist on the Hours of Scripture reading being called School Hours or not being called School Hours; our Stipulations in that respect being, that the Hour for reading the Scriptures shall be the first or the last Hour of the Attendance; that Notice shall be given of it; and that the Parents shall be at liberty to direct their Children to attend at that Hour, or to withhold them, as they shall see fit.

In all Cases, without Exception, with this Reservation and with this Explanation, the Scriptures may be read in School during School Hours, provided it be the first Hour or the last?

Yes, in all, without Exception.

You mean in those Cases in which there are Protestant Children in the Schools?

We make no Exception.

Is it to be considered that in that Case the Bible forms One of the School Books, or is it only that they happen to have the Bible in their Pockets; is it a Book kept in the Schoolroom like the Scripture Extracts?

Certainly not like the Scripture Extracts, for it is not given by the Board. The Children are at liberty to bring it, but it is not issued by the Board at Half Price or gratuitously.

It is not a recognized School Book?

I will not say it is not a recognized School Book, for their reading of the Bible is recognized.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Are you to be understood that the reading of the Bible is recommended during School Hours?

I did not use the Word "recommended;" I think there is a Paper in which we do encourage it, but I dare not answer more precisely without referring to the Paper.

You are to be understood to say that reading the Bible in the Schools is rather encouraged than otherwise?

Most undoubtedly.

Is the reading of the Bible in the Schools during School Hours rather encouraged by the Board?

I should say, without Hesitation, that they rather encourage it; but the Term in the Question was "recommended." I consider that the reading of the Bible, under the Regulations already explained, is encouraged by the Board.

Under the sole Restriction of its being read in the first or the last Hour?

Yes.

The Board would not volunteer an Encouragement of that Kind, but if they were questioned by the Conductors of the Schools they would not discourage it?

I refer to a Document in which there is that stated by the Board itself.

By one of the fundamental Rules of the Board no Books are to be read during School Hours, during the Time of ordinary Education, which are not under the special Sanction of the Board?

No Books are to be used in the ordinary Education of the Children but such as are allowed by the Board. I do not say in School Hours; but I say that no Books are to be used in the School for ordinary Instruction,—for common Instruction,—but such as are allowed by the Board.

Do you mean to say that if School commences at Nine o'Clock and lasts till Four a Choice may be made whether the Testament shall be used in the first Hour or the last Hour; from Nine to Ten, or from Three to Four?

Yes; or both Hours, if they please.

In Lord Stanley's Letter to the Duke of Leinster it is said, — "The Commissioners will exercise the most entire Control over all Books to be used in the Schools, whether in the combined Moral and Literary or separate Religious Instruction; none to be employed in the first except under the Sanction of the Board, nor in the latter but with the Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with those for whose Use they are intended." You will perceive, therefore, that during the Time of Moral and Literary Instruction, which of course is School Hours, no Books are to be employed except under the Sanction of the Board?

If the School Hours are thus defined, then the reading of the Bible is not under the Sanction of the Board.

Then the Bible cannot be used during School Hours?

During the School Hours, in that Sense.

In what Sense?

In the Sense of combined Literary Education. I have no Wish to disguise the Fact that any other Religious Instruction might go on, Roman Catholic or Protestant, during the first or the last Hour.

The Board say that "they will also permit and encourage the Clergy to give Religious Instruction to the Children of their respective Persuasions, either before or after the ordinary School Hours, on the other Days of the Week." There is a Distinction made between School Hours and ordinary Hours; whereas Lord Stanley keeps the Religious Instruction out of the School Hours; according to your Explanation, the Board and Lord Stanley differ?

No, we do not. There was a Correspondence with Lord Stanley upon that Subject, and also a Correspondence with the Synod of Ulster upon the same Subject; and I now speak, not from Lord Stanley's Letter as it originally stands, but upon the whole Correspondence with Government upon the Subject, explained as it has been, and intimated to the Public as it has been.

Then

Rev. J. Carlile.

Then it is with Explanations given in Documents in the Possession of the Public?

I cannot say that.

Is it to be understood that Lord Stanley's Letter contains the Constitution which the Board was to carry into effect?

Lord Stanley's Letter gave the original Constitution, but that has been to a certain Extent modified, partly by Lord Stanley's subsequent Communications, and partly by other Communications with Government. No Modification has been permitted but with the Consent of Government, but there have been small Modifications since that Letter was written; and I now speak of the System of the Board as it is explained and modified. There was a very important Letter of Lord Stanley's, as I have said, of which I believe we have not a Copy in London, and a Correspondence with the Synod of Ulster, which is in London, in which some of those Explanations appear.

Can you undertake before the Committee next meet to supply yourself with those Documents?

I will write immediately for that Letter of Lord Stanley to which I allude.

You are aware that the general Impression in the Country is that the Regulations of the Board are founded on Lord Stanley's Letter?

Of course they are founded on Lord Stanley's Letter; but the Synod of Ulster, which occupies so prominent and important a Station in the Province of Ulster, presented certain Propositions to Government during Earl Grey's Administration, which were acceded to, and which caused a Modification in the Regulations of the Board.

What Means were taken to notify that Modification to the Public?

I cannot enumerate all the Means that were taken; but our old Rules were changed and modified, and all our Schedules for Applications since that Time have been in a different Form from those previously circulated.

The Synod of Ulster's Propositions were granted to the Synod?

They were accepted as a Part of the general Rules of the Board from that Time, but not particularly to the Synod.

It was announced to the Synod of Ulster?

Certainly; a Resolution to that Effect can be produced.

Was there not an Ambiguity in the Use of the Expression "School Hours," which produced some Perplexity and some Discussion?

Certainly. Lord Stanley's Letter, to which I have alluded, which, I think, was not called for by Parliament, and has not been published, goes precisely to state what he intended by "School Hours" in his original Letter.

Whether the Concession of the Synod of Ulster's Propositions was announced to the Public you do not know?

It was announced in this Way, that all our Letters sent out in answer to Applications were altered in conformity to the Propositions of the Synod, and it was announced by me in a Circular to every individual Member of the Synod.

The Paper that went forth to the Public as the Terms on which the Board acted after that Time contained the Terms of the Propositions?

They embodied the Synod's Propositions.

That is to say, that the new Formularies were drawn up in conformity to those Resolutions?

Certainly.

Did you not announce that you had changed your Formularies?

I cannot recollect whether we did give any public Intimation of that or not.

The Scripture Extracts, and all those Publications, require the Consent of the entire Board to sanction them?

The Scripture Extracts require the Sanction of the entire Board; not merely a Majority.

Rev. J. Carlile.

That is in consequence of one of your own Rules, is it not, and not required by Lord Stanley's Letter?

It originated from the Manner in which they were introduced. The first Draft of the Letter did not contemplate Scripture Extracts. A Question was put by me previously to the Board being constituted, whether we should be permitted to make Extracts; a good deal of Conversation took place upon the Subject, and Lord Stanley at last said, that whatever the Board was unanimous upon the Government would not object to; upon the Ground of that Conversation came the Expression in the Rule that it must be the entire Board.

In other Cases you decide as other Bodies do, by the Majority?

We never have had any Division, but we should in that Case; but this requires the Consent of the whole Board.

In the Use of the Scripture Extracts you contemplate that the Masters shall examine the Children, and explain them?

We contemplate that they shall examine the Children, certainly.

The Scripture Extracts contain Notes?

Yes.

These Notes contain References to different Readings and Translations?

Yes; it might have been judicious to have divided those Notes into explanatory Notes and Scholiæ, and to have placed under the Head of Scholiæ Notes of that Description where they found it necessary to introduce them. This was introduced in consequence of the very strong Opposition that was made to the Board, and were certainly intended rather to meet Objections than for the Use of the Teachers or the Children.

Do you not believe that it is generally understood by the Masters of the Schools that it is a Part of their Duty to explain, or at least that they have the Privilege of explaining, in any Manner they please, any Portion of the Extracts read by the Children?

All we understand or recommend them to do is to see that the Children understand the Lessons; and there are at the End of each Lesson Questions, for Answers to which Reference must be made to the Notes.

These Notes of course the Teachers must read, for the Purpose of giving Explanations to the Children; and have they not had the Right or Privilege of giving those Explanations, and calling upon the Children to read them?

Not farther than the Notes are embodied in the Questions. Some of these Questions may refer to the Notes, and others only to the Text; they are of course expected to ask those Questions which are at the End of the Lessons, whether they refer to the Notes or to the Lessons.

Though they are not required to explain the Notes, there is no Objection to their doing it?

No.

The Schoolmasters who are Roman Catholics have under their Instruction the Children of Protestants, and vice versâ?

They have, sometimes.

Do not your Rules require it should be so?

No; there is no Rule to that Effect.

It is generally so?

I believe the Fact is generally that where the larger Proportion of the Children are Roman Catholics the Master is a Roman Catholic.

Then it must necessarily follow that where there is a Minority of Protestants all the Explanations of Scripture Extracts will be given by Roman Catholic Masters?

Certainly.

There

Rev. J. Carlile

There are Notes annexed to the Scripture Extracts, some of which are intended to be the Subject of Examination of the Pupils?
They are intended for the Explanation of the Text to the Children and the Masters; the Masters may very properly refer to those Notes.

So far as they are taken up in the Questions they are the proper Subject of Examination of the Children by the Master, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic?
Yes.

But if the Master were not to confine himself to the Questions, but to give Explanations of those Notes intended for the Public, but not for the Master, should you consider that a Violation of his Duty?
No; not a Violation of his Duty, but not a Matter expected of him, and a Thing not suitable to the Children.

It is competent to the Master to examine, if he pleases, in all the Substance and all the Notes to the Scripture Extracts?
There would be an Objection to a Master examining upon Doctrinal Subjects; to bring out Doctrinal Subjects not immediately expressed in the Text.

You stated before, that in all the Matter of the Notes the Master might, if he pleased, examine; you now say that that is to be limited to Matters that do not relate to Doctrine; is there any Rule to that Effect?
No, there is no Rule; I merely speak as to the Feeling of the Board. We have objected to the Introduction of Doctrinal Subjects in the Model School, and we would object to an Examination into systematic Doctrine of any Kind in any of our Schools.

Is there anything in any Rule of the Board that goes out to the Master, to restrain him from examining the Children on any Part of the Matter contained in the Notes to the Scripture Extracts?
I do not recollect any written Rule to that Effect.

You stated that they might examine them in all before the Distinction struck you?
I said both in the Lessons and Notes, but with this Reservation, that they must avoid disputed Doctrinal Points.

You would wish they did not examine them in Doctrinal Points, but there is no Rule to that Effect?
I do not recollect any, but I cannot answer that positively; there may be an Intimation of that Kind.

What is the general Character of the Notes; do they relate partly or principally to Doctrinal Matter?
No; they are merely Explanations of Words; geographical Notices of the Towns or other Places mentioned; sometimes Inferences drawn from the Text of a moral Character. But as it would be easy to bring Doctrinal Matter out of any Lesson or Notes by the Mode of conducting the Examination, we should object to any Examination diverging into Doctrinal Subjects.

There is no Rule limiting the Teachers to the Questions they put upon the Lessons?
I do not recollect any.

Your Impression would be against the Fitness of their examining in Doctrinal Matters?
Yes.

Do you refer that to the Notes?
Out of the Notes or anywhere else.

Have you any Reason to suppose, from the Information you have received, that where the Master is a Roman Catholic he has in the ordinary Course of Education gone into Doctrinal Matters?
I never have heard of any such Instance, and I am very confident no such Instance has happened.

Do you think that the Master could go into the full Explanation of the Text

Rev. J. Carlile.

and the Notes in those Extracts without necessarily going into Doctrinal Matters?

That is a Question I really cannot answer. Were I as a Clergyman to go fully into the Lessons or Notes I should go into Doctrinal Sentiments.

Are there not some Notes referring generally to Doctrinal Matters?

No, I think not. There is one Note in which Roman Catholics explain their View of Penance, which may be considered doctrinal; we excluded the Word "Penance" from the Lessons, they being permitted to state in a Note their View of Penance, and how far it was synonymous with Repentance.

If you learned that any Teacher had gone into the Consideration of controversial Subjects in his ordinary Course of Education, would you take upon you to reprimand him?

Certainly; more especially if any Complaint were made by the Parents that Doctrines had been stated contrary to their Opinions. We should put a Stop to the Practice; but we trust chiefly to the Parents, as the proper Guardians of their Children, to prevent any such Interference with their Principles on the Part of the Teachers.

You have said that there is no Regulation to prevent their giving Explanation of those Extracts if they thought proper?

I do not recollect any, nor have we found any such Regulation necessary.

Do not you think it would be improper to censure any Man for doing that which was not prohibited?

We should censure the Practice at once of the Master teaching any thing contrary to what he knew to be the Doctrines of the Parent of the Child he was employed to instruct. How we should deal with him would depend on the Nature of the Case.

Generally speaking, are the Schoolmasters in that Sphere of Life very likely to be acquainted with and to enter into Doctrinal Controversies in explaining those Books to the Children?

I should think it very unlikely they should do so.

Is not it much more likely that they would simply read the Questions without entering into such Matters?

The Impression of the Board in my Opinion is, that they were not at all likely to explain the Notes, but that the Notes might be of use to guide them in examining the Children according to the Questions provided for them.

Having inspected Schools yourself, do you think they are Persons who would adopt that Mode of proceeding?

I saw no Instances of that Mode of Interference with the Religious Principles of the Children, nor do I believe that it has taken place.

Are not the lower Classes of Roman Catholics in general very fond of those Controversies?

I am not aware that they are.

Are you an Irishman?

I am a Scotchman.

How long have you resided in Ireland?

I have resided since the Year 1812 chiefly in Ireland; that is, upwards of Twenty-four Years.

How are the Teachers of the Schools appointed?

They are appointed by the Patrons and Guardians of the Schools on the Spot.

With the Approbation of the Board?

The Names are returned to the Board by the Patrons; we reserve to ourselves the Right of rejecting a Schoolmaster if he is not competent.

You can only enforce that by withholding Assistance?

Yes; there is a Distinction in this respect in our Schools. In those Schools in which we give nothing more than the Salary we can do nothing more than withhold the Salary, but in Schools towards which we have contributed it

is

is necessary that we should be able to do more, and we can then call upon the Trustees to enforce our Resolution to reject the Master.

Do you find that that Recommendation in respect to Teachers is attended to?
I conceive it is.

What is your Opinion of the Teachers in respect of their Competency and moral Character?
I think upon the whole their moral Character is respectable; in point of Competency many of them are very inferior. We have had no Opportunity yet of training Teachers; we have been obliged to take the Masters already to be found in the Country, trained or not trained, and they are upon the whole a very inferior Class of Teachers. This arises, I believe, chiefly from their extreme Poverty.

Are not the Masters the Sons of Peasants?
I believe they are chiefly the Sons of small Farmers.

Do you believe that upon the whole their moral Character is good?
There are of course Instances, which is to be expected in such a Number of Persons, where they have been found otherwise; but I believe they are decent Persons in general.

Have you ever discharged any of them for being of immoral Character?
Yes; we have insisted on some being dismissed.

You say that the Teachers are appointed by the Patrons, and that the Board have a Power of refusing their Sanction to the Appointment?
Yes.

Have you firmly acted upon that Principle?
Yes.

There has been no Alteration of the Practice?
No.

That is now done?
Yes.

On what Authority did the Board depart from the Instructions of Lord Stanley's Letter, which says, "They will allow to the Individuals or Bodies applying for Aid the Appointment of their own Teacher, subject to the following Restrictions and Regulations: 1st. He (or she) shall be liable to be fined, suspended, or removed altogether by the Authority of the Commissioners, who shall however record their Reasons; 2d. He shall have received previous Instruction in a Model School in Dublin, to be sanctioned by the Board"?
There will be an Explanation of that Sentence found afterwards.

And with this Explanation the Practice of the Board has been according to this Rule?
Yes.

The Explanation is in these Words: "It is not intended that this Regulation should apply to prevent the Admission of Masters or Mistresses of Schools already established, who may be approved of by the Commissioners." With that Explanation the Board has uniformly complied with the Injunctions of my Lord Stanley's Letter?
I do not understand the Question.

This Explanation making Part of the Rule, the Rule so recommended has been uniformly acted on by the Board?
I think there is a further Explanation besides that.

Will you be so good as to point it out?
I confess I do not find the Clause that I expected in this Copy of Lord Stanley's Letter; but we have in all Cases acted upon this Rule in the Schools that were already established, and we have acted upon it to the utmost Extent we could in Schools which we have established.

Rev. J. Carlile.

There is a general Rule there given in the Code which is to direct the Commissioners. You have said at first that the Board have uniformly complied with the Injunction respecting Teachers, with that Explanation ; do you adhere to that Assertion?

I will state precisely what we do, and then I will leave it to the Committee to say whether we have acted up to the Spirit of the Rule or not. The Manner in which we have acted with reference to Schools which have been established has been, to receive Testimonials of good Conduct and of general Fitness for the Situation.

That has always been observed with regard to Schoolmasters of Schools already established?

We have no trained Masters of our own.

The Question refers to those Schools newly established?

Of course it follows that as we have no trained Masters we must take such as are recommended to us.

You have always required to have Characters given of those?

We have always required that there should be a Character given to us, both in regard to Schools already established and to new Schools ;—we have, in regard to all Schools established by us. We have certainly (not having a Model School), when Schools have been built, permitted the Patrons of Schools to appoint the Schoolmaster, subject to our Sanction. Applications have been made to us for Aid in building Schools, and we have made Grants, always in the Expectation that before the Buildings were finished we might be in Circumstances to supply them with trained Masters ; and we have been constantly representing to Government the Necessity of enabling us to proceed more rapidly with the training of Masters. But when Schoolhouses have been completed, not having till this Day any Masters educated by us for Teachers, we have been compelled, either to permit the Patrons of the Schools to elect Masters, or to insist on the Schoolhouses being kept empty. Not being able so fully as we have wished to carry into effect the original Design, not having sufficient Money to erect a Model School, and undertake the training of the Schoolmasters, we have been under the Necessity of permitting the Patrons and Guardians in those newly erected Schools to act precisely as they did in Schools which had been previously established. That has been the Practice of the Board.

The Rule contemplates that in every School to be established there shall be a trained Teacher?

That seems to be the Aspect of it.

Would it have been possible, from the Number of Applications made for Schools, that anything like that Number could have been established if that Rule had been adhered to?

We could not have supplied them at all, for we have had no Model School. We have been applying for the Means of training Teachers ; in the meantime we were making Grants for the Erection of Schools. The Question then is, whether we should keep those Schools standing empty and without any Scholars in them till we got a Model School, the People having contributed their Share of the Expense of erecting the Schoolhouse, or go on with those Schools as if they were already established, and permit the Patrons on the Spot to elect Schoolmasters for them.

You would have appointed trained Schoolmasters to the full Extent which the Establishment for a Model School admitted of your doing if you had had a Model School?

Certainly. The only Thing we have had the Opportunity of doing was not to educate young Men to be Masters, but to bring up Masters already elected to Schools, and to keep them Three Months in Dublin. We have always intended to carry into effect the Letter as well as the Spirit of the Rule, as soon as we should be enabled to do so, but we conceive we were acting most in the Spirit of the Instructions by placing those new Schools on the same Footing with the old Schools till we had an Opportunity of dealing with them according to the Letter of the Rule.

What

Rev. J. Carlile.

What Steps have you taken to establish a Model School?
There is a Model School at present, but not a training Establishment; that is, an Establishment for educating and training Teachers.

Why was not that established sooner?
For Want of Funds. We had a Model School nearly from the Commencement of our Operations, on a very limited Scale, in consequence of the limited Accommodation we then possessed. We took as many Masters as we could, and brought them up Fifty or Sixty at a Time, giving them Three Months Education; but neither the Accommodation we possessed in House-room, nor the Funds granted to us, would allow us to go further.

Do you or not think that the Spirit of this Rule is, that there shall be Teachers trained before any Schools be established?
I do not think that is the Spirit of the Rule, with the Instructions which we have received.

Are there not now a Number of young Persons who have commenced a regular Course of training under the Board?
None, except so far as the Children of the Model Schools may be expected to become Teachers. We have been endeavouring to keep the Monitors in the Model School by allowing them a small Salary till they are capable of becoming Masters. We have not been able to proceed further than that with the Preparation of Teachers.

Your Model School is established in Dublin?
Yes.

Of what does it consist?
It consists of a Male and Female School for Children; an Infant School is erecting; but the only Part of the Model School at present in operation is the Children's Male and Female School; there is also erecting a House for the training of Teachers.

What Number is expected to be accommodated in that, and will be in training at once?
I cannot precisely answer that Question. There will be several Lecture Rooms in which Instruction will be given in various Branches of Education.

What Control do you propose to exercise over those young People when they are training for Masters?
We have not been in Circumstances to form any Rule or Judgment upon that Subject; we have kept a regular Inspection over the Masters who are brought up; they are visited occasionally at the Places where they lodge, and kept correct and orderly. We have been in communication with the Government to obtain a Place where they should be lodged together under regular Inspection.

At present you exercise a Control over their moral Conduct while in Dublin?
We do.

Are you supplied now with sufficient Funds for the Erection of a Model School?
Yes; we have erected Two Schools, and the other Buildings are in progress.

How many Teachers have you brought up?
I think we have perhaps from 150 to 200.

How many in each training Class are there?
From Forty to Fifty.

Have you any Means of knowing whether the Religious Instruction of those Classes is attended to?
They are placed under the Care of a Clergyman of the same Profession with themselves, and he is perfectly at liberty to give them such Religious Instruction as he thinks fit.

Is that the Clergyman of the Parish?
I cannot say the Clergyman of the Parish, but there has always been a Protestant

Rev. J. Carlisle.

testant Clergyman and a Roman Catholic in attendance, and they have been put under their Control.

Have you Reason to think the Morals of those Persons have been attended to?

Yes, they have been attended to; for we have dismissed One or Two in consequence of their falling into Drunkenness; every thing has been done which can be done in their present Circumstances; but great Difficulty arises from their not being lodged in some Place under our Control or Inspection.

Have you Reason to believe that their Conduct has been incorrect, except in the Instances where you have dismissed them, or that they were of irreligious Character?

No.

That they are not Believers in natural and revealed Religion?

No Reason whatever to believe so; they are always regularly instructed in the Scripture Extracts—and this may serve as an Answer to a Question formerly put—for the Purpose of putting them into Possession of the Kind of Explanations which the Board expect them to give to the Children.

Do they undergo any Examination?

Regularly.

By whom?

By the Head Master of the Model School, and by the other Masters.

Is there a Clergyman of their Persuasion?

With regard to the Examination by the Clergyman, that depends upon the Mode in which the Clergyman of the Profession they belong to may deal with them.

Is the Head Master of the Model School a Clergyman?

Certainly not.

Neither of the Protestant or Roman Catholic Church?

No.

Is any Means taken to ascertain their Knowledge of Scripture?

I cannot say; the Protestants are put into the Hands of a Protestant Clergyman, and he takes care, I apprehend, to see that they have that Knowledge.

Is any Report made to the Board on that Point?

Not on that Point, for that would require us to receive a Report with respect to the Measures adopted by the Roman Catholic Clergy as to their Doctrine.

You receive no Report of the Degree of Religious Instruction possessed by the Schoolmasters?

No, certainly not. Provision is made for their obtaining Religious Instruction, for which Purpose they are put into the Hands of Clergymen of their own Persuasion.

The Head Master examines them in all they will have an Opportunity of giving Instruction in, and all the Books they will have occasion to teach from?

Yes; including the Scripture Extracts.

Do you know the Religion of the Persons who apply to become Teachers?

Always.

What Proportion of those that have been educated in your Model School have been Roman Catholics?

I should think the larger Proportion Roman Catholics, but about the same Proportion as the Schools under Roman Catholic Superintendence chiefly bears to those under Protestant Superintendence.

Are they required, between the Close of the School in the Afternoon and the opening the next Morning, to study?

Yes; there are Lessons given them to prepare, and till Accommodation is obtained

obtained for lodging them together we chiefly rely upon their being kept constantly employed as the Means of preventing them from getting into Mischief.

Do you remember any Instance in which, from their not being able to answer as they ought in the Morning, it has been suspected they did not properly employ their Time?

Yes; I think One or Two of those who were found drunk were detected in that Way.

Drunkenness is the prevailing Sin in Dublin?

I am afraid it is too much so.

You say they are visited?

They are visited from Time to Time; in the first place by the Head Master, occasionally, and if they absent themselves on the Ground of Sickness they are visited by a Medical Man, under the Direction of the Board.

They are visited occasionally by the Head Master?

Yes; he endeavours to satisfy himself that they are in their Lodgings at proper Times; he takes the Steps he considers necessary for that Purpose.

There is a regular Return made of their Conduct?

Yes.

It is known where every one lodges?

Certainly.

And occasionally the Head Master visits them in their Lodgings?

Yes.

Do they lodge in point of fact together, or just as it may happen?

Generally I believe a few of them together.

As you came from Scotland originally, perhaps you can tell where it is the Schoolmasters in that Country are educated?

A considerable Number of the Schoolmasters have been at College; a considerable Number of them are Persons who have been looking forward to the Church, but either betake themselves to teaching while they are preparing for the Church, or, having been disappointed, sit down as Schoolmasters permanently.

There are some of an inferior Class?

These are educated in the common Schools of the Country.

Where was Dr. M'Arthur, the Head Master, educated?

Partly I believe at a School in the Neighbourhood of Edinburgh, and partly in the College of Edinburgh.

He is a Scotchman?

He is.

At what Institution or School do you say he was educated?

I cannot say. He was at College I believe at some of the Classes, but I do not know whether he received his full Education there; he was educated I believe principally by a Relative who had a School in the Neighbourhood of Edinburgh.

Was he then Master of a Parochial School?

He was one of the Masters of a School in Edinburgh called the Circus Place School; not Parochial. I brought him from Edinburgh to take the Management of a School I was establishing under my own Superintendence, and he was for a considerable Time acting under my own Observation. After the Board was established, I recommended him to the Commissioners in consequence of his extreme Efficiency, feeling quite confident that he was fully capable of superintending the Model School.

What is his Salary?

300*l.* a Year.

Have you any Measure in contemplation by which you hope to be able to retain the Services of these Men when they have been trained?

That is a Point on which we have found great Difficulty. From the small

Rev. J. Carlile.

Salary we are able to give, as soon as we have trained them we are in danger of losing them, and have lost some of the best of them. And we have made a Representation to Government on the Subject, recommending that they should enable us to increase their Salaries. The Recommendation of the Board was given in consequence of our finding that some additional Inducement was absolutely necessary to retain our best Masters.

When the Board receives an Application for a Grant what Steps do they take?

A printed Formula is sent to the Person who writes to us, which contains Directions to have the Blanks filled up and Signatures attached to it, Protestant or Roman Catholic, as it may be. On the first Establishment of the Board Government were extremely anxious to know whether the System was likely to be received generally in the Country, for the Purpose of determining whether Application should be made to Parliament for a Grant, and to what Amount, and we were under the Necessity of receiving Schools on the Applications with suitable Signatures, but without any further Inspection. According as we were able we rendered our Plans more perfect, and we have adopted for a considerable Time the Rule that no Schools shall be received without Inspection on the Spot; that is one Check. Our Inspector visits the School, and makes Inquiries respecting the Person applying to us, and on his Report on the Applications we make the Grant.

You do not make the Grants without sending an Inspector to inquire into the local Circumstances?

No.

How long has that Rule existed?

I must answer that Question as I did a former one; that we became more strict as we were able to be so.

What is the System of Inspection you have exercised over the Schools now established?

We have Eight Inspectors, who are out nearly the whole of the Year. They cannot give more than one Inspection to each School in the Year, unless something transpires calling for additional Inspection, then an Inspector is sent to inquire into anything which calls for special Investigation.

Do not you conceive that is too seldom?

Yes, and we have recommended that there should be local Inspection in connexion with County Model Schools.

In fact that Difficulty with regard to Inspection is occasioned very much by the Want of local Interest on the Part of the Gentry or Clergy of the Country?

I conceive not. I conceive that if the Measures which we have recommended were adopted we should obtain a very extensive Co-operation of the Nobility and Gentry at least, if not the Protestant Clergy of the Country. I made it a Point during a Visit to the South to ascertain whether we were likely to obtain such Co-operation from the Gentry and Clergy on the Spot as might furnish an efficient local Inspection according to the Plan laid down, and I found very good Reason to expect we should obtain a most efficient local Inspection.

You did not establish anything of that Nature?

No.

You have not confined the Inspection of the Schools to the Inspectors appointed by your Commission?

Besides this a Right is reserved to the Clergymen of the different Persuasions to inspect all our Schools.

Have they ever been impeded in that Right?

Not that I am aware of; there have been Reports to that Effect, but I do not recollect any official Report on the Subject. If any Report of such a Circumstance had been made to the Board the Aid to that School would have been immediately withdrawn.

On that being duly authenticated?
Of course.

Are you aware of any Complaint of that Kind having been made to the Board?
I do not recollect any thing of the Kind.

Has that Right been much exercised?
To a considerable Extent it has been. In examining the Schools, as I have mentioned, to the Amount of Seventy-five, in the South and West, I learned that in a considerable Number of Instances the Clergy had visited the Schools, and some had written in the Report Book their Opinions of it.

The Clergy of the Church of England?
Yes.

Do you mean belonging to the Parish in which the School was situated, or occasional Visitors?
In one or two Instances they were the Clergymen of the Parish, but I have not the Means of knowing whether that was the Case always.

Did they sign their Names stating the Parish with which they were connected?
In the Instances to which I alluded.

If they did not sign their Names, how are you able to state whether they were Clergymen?
Some signed their Names with their Designation.

How could you know as to any that they were Clergymen if they did not sign their Names and Designations?
I allude to those who did sign their Names and Designations; but I referred to Information that I received casually in Conversation.

Does the Board direct the Inspector to report on each School?
Certainly.

So that you could refer to the particular Report upon any School which might be mentioned?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next,
Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 6° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Reverend JAMES CARLILE is called in, and further examined as follows:

You stated on Friday that the Board had taken no Steps to ascertain the Proficiency of Religious Knowledge on the Part of Persons in the Model School, or their Religious Opinions?
That the Board have taken themselves no such Steps, with this Exception, that the Head Master of the Model School examines the Masters in the Contents of our Scripture Extracts. They are made Masters of them so as to enable them to teach the Children in their respective Schools.

Have you taken any Steps to ascertain further than that their Proficiency in Religious Knowledge?
We have taken no further Steps to make the Board acquainted with their Religious Knowledge.

Is your Reason for abstaining from making Inquiry that you do not trust to those Teachers to give Religious Instruction to the Children in the Schools?
Certainly.

You trust to the Clergymen of the different Persuasions, and those employed under their Directions, to which the Children belong, to give that Instruction?
Certainly.

And those Persons that are instructed in the Model School have no other Religious Instruction to give to the Children than examining them in the Extracts published by the Board, and asking the Questions that are attached to those Extracts?
Just so. Your Lordship said those who are employed under the Direction of the Clergy; we rather permit the Parents or Guardians of the Children to choose the Persons to be employed in the Religious Instruction of the Children, so that if they choose to employ the Masters in giving that Instruction or having Prayers with the Children they are at liberty to do so.

Do you conceive the Knowledge of Scripture conveyed by the Scripture Extracts to be a sufficient Knowledge of Religion?
No, certainly not. Every one would answer that Question according to his own Views. I should suppose Roman Catholics would not, nor should I on my Part, for I regard the whole Bible as necessary to a complete Religious Instruction. But our Extracts, especially when they shall be completed, will convey perhaps as much of Religious Instruction as Children are capable of receiving at School.

You conceive that a Person who has only such Knowledge as is conveyed by those Extracts will not have received a sufficient Religious Education?
He has not, in my Opinion, received a complete Religious Education through those Extracts.

If he has no other Knowledge than that acquired through those Extracts you conceive he has not received a sufficient Religious Education?
Certainly not, particularly for a complete Religious Instruction, and especially not for one who is to be the Religious Instructor of others.

You have no Knowledge whether the Schoolmasters trained in the Model Schools have a sufficient Religious Education?
According to my View of the Subject I believe many of them must have

Rev. J. Carlile.

an erroneous Religious Education, because they are educated as Roman Catholics, or perhaps as Unitarians.

You have no Knowledge?
I can have no Knowledge of a Roman Catholic having sufficient Religious Education.

You have no Report as to the Roman Catholic Schoolmasters, whether they have sufficient Instruction in their own Creed?
I should take no Cognizance of what is a sufficient Instruction in their own Creed.

There are Members of the Board who are Roman Catholics; have they any such Reports?
We should not receive any Reports upon that Subject at the Board.

At the Board you do not inquire into that in any way?
Certainly not.

As a Board you are not aware whether the Masters who go from the Model School have received sufficient Religious Education?
Certainly not.

Have you any additional Information to give respecting the Appointment of Masters in the Schools?
As your Lordships perhaps may remember, when the Right Reverend Prelate read the Rule on that Subject, with the Qualifications, I said I thought there was more than his Lordship read; his Lordship then handed to me the printed Copy of Lord Stanley's Letter, in which I could not find the Passage I alluded to; I find however that there is an additional Clause which, perhaps owing to some Confusion, I did not see in the Copy handed to me; but there is in the Copy of Lord Stanley's Letter, communicated to us for our Guidance, the Clause which I expected to find. This is a Copy of that Letter as it was put into our Hands by Lord Stanley, printed not by us, but by Government; and if the qualifying Nota bene stands, as I suppose it does, in the Right Reverend Prelate's Copy, it is defective.

What is the Date of that?
It is October 1831. This is a printed Copy, in Script Type, printed under the Direction of Lord Stanley at the Time he was Secretary, and a Copy given to each of the Commissioners before we accepted the Commission. In this Copy, and also in the Copy printed, but which I believe was transcribed from our Minute Book, the N. B. stands thus:—" N. B. It is not intended that this Regulation should apply to prevent the Admission of Masters or Mistresses of Schools already established, who may be approved of by the Commissioners." There I think the Nota bene in his Lordship's Copy stopped, but in this it goes on, " nor of such as the Board may think fit to appoint before the proposed Model School may come into full Operation." I should have considered we were acting in the Spirit of our Instructions had there been no such Clause; but if there had been no such express Clause I should have expected that we should have had a Communication with Government upon the Subject, and I could remember that we had had such a Communication. I find however, on Reference to our Instructions, that there is a Clause empowering us to do the very Thing that has been called in question.

You stated that you believed the Practice of reading the Scriptures during the Hour for Religious Instruction was distinctly recognized, but could not recollect in what Document; have you brought to your Recollection any such Document?
I have. The Impression upon my Mind was, that there was such a Document, but I could not at the Moment recollect what it was. I find what I referred to was the Instructions to our Inspectors, and the Passage to which I allude I shall read.

What is the Date of those Instructions?
They were issued pretty nearly at the Commencement of the Operations of the Board, but I do not see that there is any Date given on the printed Copy; they

Rev. J. Carlile.

they are however before the House of Commons, in consequence of being brought forward by Mr. Blake in an Examination before a Committee of that House about Two Years ago. The Passage to which I allude is this :—" As the Holy Scripture is itself unhappily a Subject of Controversy in this Country, both with regard to the Books which constitute Scripture and to the Translation of it, and as the Introduction of the Bible into Schools for common Education has created much Contention and Dispute, and prevented a very large Proportion of the poorer Classes of Ireland from sending their Children to Schools receiving Government Aid, it is not to be introduced during the Hours set apart for common Education ; but every Facility is to be given for the reading and explaining of the Scriptures, either before or after these Hours, or for any other Mode of communicating Religious Instruction by such Pastors or other Persons as are approved by the Parents or Guardians of the Children."

Can you give the Date of those Instructions, as it appears to differ from the Copy returned to Parliament?

There was an Alteration made upon these Instructions in consequence of the Adoption of the Propositions presented by the Synod of Ulster and the other Modifications of the System, which caused us to alter the whole of our Documents. I cannot precisely state the Date of it; it must have been, probably, subsequent to Mr. Blake's Examination.

You will recollect that on the last Day of meeting you were specially desired to produce a Copy of the Regulations subsequent to the Concessions to the Synod of Ulster?

This is a Copy of our Rules as they now stand, also altered in consequence of the same Modifications.

Will you give in a Copy of the Rules so altered?

Certainly. The Rules which have been altered in consequence of the Modifications referred to also contain a Recognition of the Practice of reading the Scriptures at the Hours appointed for Religious Instruction. The Rules on that Subject stand thus :—" One Day at least in each Week (independently of the Sunday) is to be set apart for the Religious Instruction of the Children, on which Day such Pastors or other Persons as are approved of by the Parents or Guardians of the Children shall have Access to them for that Purpose, whether those Pastors have signed the original Application or not. The Managers of Schools are also expected, should the Parents of any of the Children desire it, to afford convenient Opportunity and Facility for the same Purpose, either before or after the ordinary School Business (as the Managers may determine), on other Days of the Week. Any Arrangement of this Description that may be made is to be publicly notified in the Schools, in order that those Children, and those only, may be present at the Religious Instruction whose Parents and Guardians approve of their being so. The reading of the Scriptures, either in the Authorized or Douay Version, is regarded as a Religious Exercise, and, as such, is to be confined to those Times which are set apart for Religious Instruction. The same Regulation is also to be observed respecting Prayer." There is still another Document to which I would refer, namely, the Preface to the First Number of our Scripture Extracts, the latter Part of which runs as follows :—" The Commissioners offer these Extracts from Scripture to the careful Attention of Teachers and Children, not only as Truth, but as Truth recorded under the Influence of Inspiration, and Truth with which it is of the utmost Importance for them to be well acquainted ; and to the Religious Instructors of the Children, they cheerfully leave, in communicating that Instruction, the Use of the Sacred Volume itself, as containing those Doctrines and Precepts a Knowledge of which must lie at the Foundation of all true Religion." " The Law of the Lord is unspotted, converting Souls ; the Testimony of the Lord is faithful, giving Wisdom to little ones." That is the Conclusion of the Preface to the First Number of our Extracts.

Have you any Recollection of any Clergymen of the Established Church having stated that they had themselves no Objection to the Board, but that they had declined joining it in consequence of the Opposition which had been given to the System?

I stated the first Day that that was my Impression, but I could not fix on

Rev. J. Carlile.

the Origin of it. I believe I must refer to His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, who has mentioned from Time to Time to the Board that Clergymen have stated that to him; that I suppose must be the Ground of my Impression.

No Clergyman has stated that to you?
Not that I remember.

You state that the Date of that Letter of Lord Stanley was October 1831?
Yes. There is a singular Omission; the Date of the Month is not put to it. I rather think it was the 31st of October.

The Copy of Lord Stanley's Letter laid before the House is dated 31st October 1831?
That Letter was not returned by us. I cannot give any Account of the Difference.

What is that printed Paper in your Hand?
It was sent round to us before we accepted of the Commission. It is printed in Script Type for the Purpose of being easily sent round to all the Members.

That very Copy was received by you about the Time that it bears Date?
Certainly; it was received in the Office of the Board. I cannot answer for its being my own Copy.

Where did you get that Paper in your Hand?
I brought it from the Office in Dublin.

Can you say of your own Knowledge that that Paper was deposited in the Office before the End of the Year 1831?
Certainly; this particular Paper.

Be good enough to state the Measures adopted by the Board for investigating the Merits of the different Applications made to them?
What is done in the first instance is, that when an Application is made to us by Letter we send a printed Schedule containing Questions to be answered, with Directions for Signatures to be put, Roman Catholic or Protestant; those are all examined by the Secretary, to see that all things are technically correct according to our Rules; such as that there are Answers to the different Queries given, and that technically it is ready to be laid before the Board. On the first Constitution of the Board these Applications were all brought before the full Board, but they became so numerous, and the Board had so many other Things to attend to, that it became impossible for the Board to go over them at its Meetings; there was then an Arrangement by which I became Resident Commissioner, and they came before me, along with the Secretary and sometimes another paid Officer of the House, and they were examined carefully by myself, from whatever Part of the Country they might come. Some were Applications for the building of Houses; in these Cases we have a Method of estimating the Expenses of a House of certain Dimensions, and the proper Dimensions of a House for a given Number of Scholars; and if there is nothing peculiar in the Case, it is then recommended to the Board, who usually made the Grant on the Report of this Sub-Committee. If there is any Feature in the Case not previously determined, it is carefully reserved for the Determination of the Board, and their Decision in those Cases form the Rules by which the Sub-Committee is regulated in its future Recommendations.

What Precautions do you take as to the actual Issue and Payment of the Money so granted?
We do not pay Money till a Certificate has been sent to us, signed by Persons concerned in the building, of the Money having been actually expended. If the Money expended does not amount to the whole stated in the original Estimate, we reduce our Grant in proportion to the Reduction of the Expenditure; sometimes the Expenditure is more; we do not always increase our Grant on that account; but sometimes there are Applications made by which it is shown that the Applicants had not included certain Items in the original Estimate, and sometimes additional Grants have been made and sometimes have

Rev. J. Carlile.

have been refused under those Circumstances. We are only acquiring Experience upon the Subject; we wish to have these Applications so arranged that the first Application will include every thing necessary. When those Certificates come to the Office they are examined again as to the Technicalities by the Accountant and Clerks, and the whole of them are then brought to me; I then see that the Demand corresponds with the Grant, and then apply to the Board for a Draft to make the Payment; and, having lodged this Draft, I issue to the inferior Officer the necessary Drafts for the Payment of these Sums respectively.

You said that the Monies are not paid from the Board till a Certificate has been sent of the Money actually expended by the Persons concerned in the building; whom do you understand by the Persons concerned?

The Persons who have made the Application and have engaged to see the Building completed, and signed the Applications agreeing to have the School conducted according to the Plan of the Commissioners.

Is there any Check upon the Fairness of those Persons if they should chance to be willing to make a false Statement to the Board?

I ought to have mentioned that before we make a Grant we send an Inspector to the Spot to examine the Case, and fully to report on it. This has been done by our ordinary Inspectors; but we have recommended to Government, in a Report which was made by me to the Board, and communicated by the Board to Government, that we should have an architectural Inspector appointed for the very Purpose of inspecting Sites of Schools previously to their being built, and again previously to the Grants being paid.

You have nothing of that Kind at present?

Not an architectural Inspector; but our other Inspectors have been employed in investigating the State of the Buildings, and seeing that the Buildings have been properly erected before the Money is paid.

Are those Inspectors, before they are appointed, duly qualified for examining into the State of Buildings and judging of Buildings to be erected?

We ask them the Question, and we have elected our Inspectors with a view to such Duty.

Have you always considered that an essential Qualification in an Inspector?

I cannot say exactly essential, but we have put Questions to them to that Effect, and we have, upon the whole Answers that have been given, considered who were the Candidates who ought to be elected; but I cannot say that has been absolutely made a Sine quâ non, that the Candidates should be acquainted with building, and that we should elect one for the Sake of that Qualification, in preference to others who might be more fit on other Grounds.

Is it considered that some Qualification of that Kind, without any very high Degree, is important?

Certainly it is looked to as important, but not in the strict Sense of the Word an absolutely essential Requisite.

Do you mean that the whole Building must be completed before you grant any Portion of the Sum which is to be paid?

No, not precisely that. There are sometimes Buildings that are pretty extensive, and the Applicants require Funds while the Building is in progress; but we require a Certificate of a certain Sum having been expended from respectable Persons on the Spot, that is, from the Persons concerned, Persons of Character, and then we sometimes pay a Sum on account, but never above Two Thirds of the Sum that has been actually expended.

You require to be satisfied that One Third has been expended?

That the whole Sum of which we pay our Proportion has been expended.

One Ground for your employing an architectural Inspector would be to ascertain that the Work has been done in such a Manner that the Two Thirds of the whole Grant may be paid?

Certainly. The Estimate is made of the whole Expense, and we agree to give a certain Sum towards it. If Money is required before the Building is completed we require a Certificate that a certain Sum has been expended, and

Rev. J. Carlile.

we sometimes give our Proportion of that Sum. When the Building is completed we require a Certificate of the whole Outlay; if the Sum expended has been less than the original Estimate we deduct a Proportion of the Grant; if it has been more we do not increase the Grant; we give only the whole Amount of the Two Thirds granted.

Have you not occasionally found that Buildings when erected have cost in fact more than the Estimate which had been originally given?
We have, frequently.

What has been done in that Case?
We have been obliged to deal with those Cases as with new Applications; sometimes we have seen fit to make an additional Grant, and sometimes to refuse it.

Then the Schools have in some Instances been left unfinished?
No; the Schools have been finished before we have paid the Sum granted.

Then the Parties must be answerable for the Remainder?
Yes; they must either make the Payment or be in Debt for it.

How many Schools have been built under your Board, speaking in round Numbers?
I cannot state the precise Number, but a considerable Number.

You state that there are Eight Inspectors employed by the Board?
Yes.

The Inspectors you say have looked as far as they could after the Expenditure of the Money you have granted?
They have.

Are those the same Inspectors you mentioned the other Day, or additional Inspectors for the Purpose of seeing that done?
They are the same Inspectors; we have no Inspectors at present but those Eight.

You stated that there are so many Schools to look after that the Inspectors could scarcely find Time to visit each School more than once a Year?
But that implies the whole of the Inspection; the Inspection of new Schools, the Inspection for Applications, the Inspection of Buildings altogether; that they cannot afford an Inspection of the Schools actually existing more than once a Year. I take in the whole of their Duties when I state that they can inspect each School only once a Year. They are obliged to examine the Cases of all new Applications, and visit Schools in the Progress of building, and visit Schools actually in operation; and the whole of their Duties, they being only Eight, are so extensive that it requires the whole of their Time nearly to give One Inspection to Schools in actual Operation.

Can the Wishes of the Board be carried into effect by those Inspectors if they only once a Year visit each School?
I think not; but it costs us Two thousand four hundred Pounds a Year for Eight Inspectors, and it would cost Double that Sum for Double the Number of Inspections. We have proposed another Plan to Government, which we conceive will be more effectual and cheaper; that is, for local Inspection.

The Duty of an Inspector is to look after a School after it is filled with Scholars as well as previous to its Completion?
To see that it is completed, and that it answers to the Estimate, and that it is conducted according to the Rules of the Board.

What Knowledge have the Board of the Religious Instruction of the Schoolmasters whom they appoint who have not been at the Model School?
We have never appointed any Schoolmaster whatever.

In whom is the Appointment?
In the local Patrons and Managers of Schools; we have no Power to appoint the Schoolmasters.

You have the Power to nominate them, have you not?
We have a Power to reject them if we are not satisfied of their Competency.

What Knowledge have you of those Persons which should entitle you either to accept or reject them?
In the first place, Certificates from Persons who appoint them of their Competency, and in the next place by our Inspectors Reports.

Do your Inspectors receive any Report of the Religious Knowledge of those Schoolmasters?
Certainly not.

No Inquiry is made upon that Point?
No Inquiry is made upon that Point; we trust to the Parents or Guardians of the Children to see that they are properly instructed in Religion according to their own Views; we cannot take cognizance of that.

Do you think the Parents of Children that are sent to the Schools are in general of a Description to understand such Subjects as that?
That is their Duty, not mine. They are responsible to God for the Religious Education of their Children, and it is for them to choose such Religious Instructors as they approve of on their own Responsibility. I cannot take upon me that Responsibility.

You have no Means of knowing that the Schoolmasters who are sanctioned by the Commission are Persons of sincere Religion, whatever their Creed may be?
They are not employed by us as Religious Teachers at all; they are not offered by us to the Public as Teachers of Religion.

Are the Committee to understand that in your Opinion a Schoolmaster would be a fitting Person to be employed in your Schools who was of no Religion at all?
Certainly not; that is a very different Question from their being competent to teach Religion. We should not I think allow any Man whom we considered as a Person of no Religion, a Man professing Infidelity, to be a Teacher under us, if we knew it.

If you have not a Knowledge of a Man's Religious Instruction, how can you tell whether he is an Infidel or not an Infidel?
We cannot tell, unless there be Information conveyed to us upon the Subject. When he is recommended to us by professing Christians we take for granted that he is also a professing Christian till something appear to the contrary.

Do you consider the Recommendation of a Clergyman as essential to the Acceptance of a Teacher?
I would not say absolutely essential; the Clergy are always applied to, and I think there are very few Schools applied for by Laymen without Clergymen.

Whoever may apply, you depend upon it that a Clergyman would not give his Certificate of the good Character of a Person unless he had a Persuasion of the Religious Belief of that Individual. Upon that you are asked whether you consider it necessary in all Cases of Teachers that are to be appointed that they should have the Certificate of some Clergyman to their Character?
I think we have no Authority in our Instructions to require that absolutely, and I think there is no positive Rule on the Subject.

In point of fact, have you always had Certificates, to the best of your Recollection, from some Clergyman, to the Character of every Teacher?
I would not say always, but almost always; and in other Cases what is almost equivalent.

In such other Cases what do you consider an Equivalent?
The Certificate of Persons whom we know to be themselves professingly Christians, although not Clergymen.

Have there been, in point of fact, Cases in which the Board has assented to the Appointment of Teachers for whom no Certificate whatever in respect to Religious Character has been given?
I cannot answer that Question from Memory.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Do you think there have been such Cases?
That I do not know; I do not remember such Cases.

Have you Reason to know or believe that there have been any such Cases?
I have no Recollection of such a Circumstance.

According to your best Judgment, do you believe there has been such a Case?
I really cannot take upon me to answer that Question; the Answers given with regard to the Qualifications and Characters of the Teachers are mixed up with such a Number of other Questions that I cannot take upon me to say whether there has been such a Case.

Might it not possibly occur that a Schoolmaster should be taken without any Certificate whatever as to his Religious Character?
Really I cannot say; but I should consider such Certificates as a Matter of very little Consequence, for I should be obliged to take the Certificate of Religious Character from Persons whose Views of Religion I do not consider to be correct, therefore I would trust to the Parents to see that no improper Person is employed to teach their Children. It is their Duty to take care that their Children are not taught by an Infidel or a Man of immoral Character. I see very little Good in Certificates; Certificates from Individuals may be obtained by almost any Person; and I should look more to the Watchfulness of the Parents for their Children, and the Clergy of the Neighbourhood, that they would not have any Man of infidel or scandalous Character appointed. I have no Doubt, although we have had no Instance of it, that if it was proved he was an Infidel or a Man of immoral Character the Board would dismiss him.

Do you appoint any Person in respect of whom any Doubt exists in your own Mind whether the Persons recommending him, of whatever Persuasion, regard him as duly instructed in Religion?
I have no Doubt whatever that in that respect he had the Confidence of the Persons who recommended him.

Are you to be understood that you do not think it of any Consequence that the Person appointed as a Schoolmaster should have any Religious Creed?
I by no means say it is a Matter of no Consequence generally that Schoolmasters should have a Character for Religion. I would prefer a Man holding strictly my own Views of Religion; but being under the Necessity of employing Teachers for Children whose Parents prefer a Roman Catholic Teacher, I cannot take cognizance of such a Man's Religious Views, whether they agree with his own Church or not; I can go no further than take cognizance of his Moral Character. If I were selecting a Teacher for Children of my own Creed I would expect him to be of the same Creed, and that he should be a Religious Man; but if I am to receive Teachers of all Religious Denominations, I should not regard Certificates of Religious Character generally as of Importance. I would willingly receive Certificates from Clergymen of all Religious Denominations for Moral Character, but not of Religious Principles.

Have you any Reason to believe that a Teacher has been appointed who was not a Christian of some Religious Denomination?
I have never heard of such an Instance, and do not believe there has been such an Instance; but if I am required to be satisfied of the Religious Opinions or Characters of Teachers I could be satisfied with nothing short of the Constitution of a Church, and either examine them myself personally, or require the Certificates of some public Body holding the same Principles with myself.

The Board, of which you form a Member, is composed of Members of most of the prevailing Religions in Ireland; is not that the Case?
It is formed from different Religious Bodies; there are Three Members of the Establishment, a Presbyterian of what is called the orthodox Faith, and there is one who is understood to be an Arian, and Two Roman Catholics; those constitute the Board; but there are other Denominations of Religion in Ireland; there are Baptists and Independents, and many others, who are not represented on the Board.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Of the Commissioners there are Three Members of the Establishment, One Presbyterian, One Unitarian, and Two Roman Catholics?
I did not say there was a Unitarian; I did not make use of that Word.

You understand them as representing those Interests in the Board to look to the Interests of the Communions to which they belong?
Certainly.

You yourself specially are bound to represent the Interests of the Presbyterians of the orthodox Faith; of course bound also to attend to all the general Interests of Religion; but you specially represent that Body?
I am not aware that the Commissioners have a special Duty to attend to the Religious Instruction of the Children of those Bodies.

Do you consider that you represent the orthodox Presbyterians of Ireland in the Sense of taking care that their Religion be fairly dealt with by the Board?
Certainly.

Just in the same Way there are Three Members of the Establishment?
Yes.

You say you are a Presbyterian of the orthodox Faith?
As it is usually called.

It is the common Phraseology?
Yes.

There are various Bodies that are called Presbyterians in Ireland?
There are.

Have the goodness to explain as succinctly as you can?
There is the general Synod of Ulster; then there is the seceding Body, which has originated in a Dissent from the Church of Scotland; that forms a very large Body, also considered as of the orthodox Faith; then there is the Synod of Munster, who have a few Congregations in the South and West.

Are they orthodox?
Some are considered to be orthodox and some not. They have no Confession of Faith.

Is there a Synod of Leinster?
No.

Is there a Synod of Dublin?
No. Two Congregations of Dublin belong to the Synod of Munster, and Two to the Synod of Ulster.

Which are those Two which belong to Munster, and who are their Ministers?
The one is what is called the Eustace Street Congregation, of which Mr. Hutton is one Minister and Doctor Ledlie the other; they are of the Synod of Munster.

Are they understood to be of the orthodox Faith?
No; they are understood to be Arians or Unitarians. There is another Congregation in Strand Street, in which there are a Dr. Armstrong and Dr. Drummond.

Are they belonging to the orthodox or the non-orthodox?
The non-orthodox, but with some Shade of Difference, I understand, from others; what it is I cannot tell.

Are they understood to be Unitarians?
They are understood to be approximating to Unitarianism, but not altogether Socinians. There is a Congregation of Seceders in Dublin connected with the seceding Body; another has been recently established, though only one has a House built.

Rev. J. Carlile.

There is a Congregation in Dublin connected with the orthodox Synod, the Synod of Ulster, is there not?

Yes, there are Two; one which meets in Capel Street or St. Mary's Abbey, and another in Usher's Quay Meeting House.

Is there any other Body of Presbyterians besides those you have mentioned?

There is besides, in the North, the Presbytery of Antrim, that separated from the Synod of Ulster a Century ago.

What is their Doctrine?

I believe they are Arians or Unitarians; they have but Nine or Ten Congregations.

There are also the Remonstrants?

Yes; most of them are understood to be not of the orthodox Class, but their avowed Objection to the Synod of Ulster was the signing of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Is it to be understood that they are Unitarians?

No, I would not say so; some of them I believe profess to be so, but I cannot say as to all.

They are generally understood to be non-orthodox?

That is the general Impression.

Does that complete the Enumeration of the Presbyterian Body, as far as you are aware?

There are some small Bodies; there is a Body of Presbyterians older than the Church of Scotland, called the Covenanters, but what their Number is I cannot say; they are orthodox.

Your Sentiments are in accordance with the Synod of Ulster?

I am a Licentiate of the Church of Scotland, and an ordained Minister of the Synod of Ulster.

Is this a correct Statement of one of the Objects which the Government had in view in the System of National Education in Ireland:—"Thirdly, to introduce as much of Religious Instruction as can be done without exciting Jealousy and Contention and hostile Feeling, either towards Government or towards one another"?

I do not understand the Question.

Is that a correct Statement?

I cannot tell what the Government Views were.

Is this a Copy of the Instruction issued by the Board?

Of course the Board conceive that was the View of Government. I conceived that the Question referred to my private Opinion of the Views of Government.

How do you conceive the Board fulfil this Instruction?

By our Scripture Extracts, and by our having issued a Book of Sacred Poetry, and still going on with the Extracts, and hoping to carry forward Religious Instruction in this Way, with the full Concurrence of all the Members of the Board; I conceive we are doing every thing we can by going together in giving such Instruction. I cannot go along with Dr. Murray in receiving Certificates of Roman Catholic Religious Instruction, nor can he go along with me in receiving Certificates of Presbyterian Religious Instruction; but we are going as far as we can together, by issuing Books of Religious Instruction in which we can be unanimous.

What Means have you of knowing that Schoolmasters whom you may approve are instructed in those Books you recommend?

We have such Means as to those who are under training. As to those not under training, we have no Means whatever of knowing it. Our Purpose is, according to our Instructions, to have all the Schoolmasters trained in the Model School, and when that is in full Operation the Masters will be fully instructed in those Books.

You have no Means of knowing that the Schoolmasters, of whose Appointment you approve, have the Power of communicating as much Religious Instruction as can be done without exciting Jealousy and hostile Feeling towards the Government or towards one another?

I do not mean to say we have no Means; we have Certificates given of their Character.

Do the Certificates you have of their Character contain any specific Description of the Degree of Religious Knowledge they possess?

No.

Do you conceive the Commissioners for National Education are in any way responsible for the Religious Opinion of the Masters chosen to those Schools?

Certainly not.

How is it you take upon yourself to reject those of whom you have Reason to suspect they are not Religious Men?

I have merely said that their being professedly Infidels would, I believe, be an Objection to them; but there is no Rule to that Effect.

Is not that taking upon yourselves the Responsibility of judging of Religious Profession?

I think that when it comes to a Question upon the Avowal of Infidelity it is a very different Question from the Distinctions of Christianity.

Is it not therefore necessary to ascertain that a Man is not an Infidel; and is it right to remain ignorant upon that Point?

I do not apprehend there would be any Objection to our having that Certificate, whether he is acknowledged as a Christian by any Denomination of professing Christians.

Do you not think that any sincere Believer, as far as you can judge, who would be competent to give Instruction out of those Books, would be able to procure a Certificate?

I conceive the Certificate as to his being a Believer would be easily obtained.

Supposing the Model School carried fully into effect, and every one appointed Schoolmaster to be trained in that School, would not you know whether he had acquired that Knowledge that he was competent to teach the Doctrines of Christianity as far as those Selections and Extracts go?

We should have the Knowledge that he was competent to teach what of those Extracts we wish him to teach; but if it regarded the Duty of the Board to see that the Religious Instruction of the Children is attended to in each Case, they never examine upon those Points.

With respect to the Difference in the Two Copies of Lord Stanley's Letter, are you to be understood that the Letter produced To-day is a Letter sent to the Commissioners individually before the Constitution of the Board, or was it the official Letter on which the Board acted?

This individual Copy was sent to the Commission before the Board was constituted, but there was no Alteration on that Point, certainly, as will appear, I doubt not, by our Minute Book; our Minute Book has it with this additional Clause, as I infer from the Edition printed by ourselves containing it.

Then after the Board was constituted a formal official Letter was sent?

I am not aware of any other official Letter being sent to the Commissioners.

At what Time was the Board regularly constituted?

I cannot precisely answer that.

Was it prior or subsequent to the 31st of October 1831?

I think subsequent to that Date.

Your Record will show precisely the Terms in which it was addressed to the Board which was formally constituted?

Certainly; it has been copied into our Minute Book.

Rev. J. Carlile.

There will be no Difficulty in ascertaining how far that official Communication to you corresponded with the previous private Communication or the Paper laid before the House of Commons?

There will be no Difficulty in ascertaining whether the Copy in our Minute Book corresponds with this printed Copy put into the Hands of the Commissioners previously to the Constitution of the Board.

The Letter purports to be a Letter addressed to the Duke of Leinster; probably the Original will be in Manuscript?

Probably; but I cannot speak as to that.

You state that the Letter is contained in the Minute Book; does the Minute Book contain any further general Instructions than those which have been laid before Parliament?

There have been the Modifications of the System, alluded to on my last Examination, and the Detail of which I now have stated for the Information of the Committee; those appear from Time to Time in the Minute Book as they occurred.

Is there any Objection to produce all the Instructions that the Board have at any Time received from the Government?

I think I have them all with me; of course there is no Objection to produce the whole of the Modifications which have been received.

The Question refers to the whole of the Instructions that have been received?

I am not aware of any other Instructions than those and the subsequent Modifications referred to.

The original Instructions with those Modifications contain the whole, do they not?

I think so.

No general Instructions of any Kind have been given since that Time?

No, nothing but those.

At what Time were the Modifications adopted by the Board?

There were several Modifications; I have them before me.

Can you state the Dates?

I was requested to bring these Documents with me, which I have done; this is a Copy of the Regulations as they were first instituted.

Issued to whom?

Regulations issued to the Public generally, as stating on what Grounds we should receive Applications. The first Letter of Lord Stanley's is dated the 13th April 1832, in which he authorizes us to dispense with requiring that a Register be kept in Schools of the Places of Worship attended by the Children. There is another Letter of Lord Stanley's, which is not dated; it was in the Beginning of the Year 1832, referring to certain Explanations of the System which had been submitted to him by us; the Introduction to these Explanations will explain its Object; it is as follows:—"The following Document, explanatory of some of the foregoing Conditions, which have been misunderstood, having been drawn up by the Commissioners as containing their Views of them, has received the Approbation and Sanction of His Majesty's Government."

Is that the Document which has been printed in Page 13 of the Publication of the Third Report?

It is. After this there was a Correspondence or Communication with the Synod of Ulster, which ended in their presenting Four Propositions. That Correspondence was called for by the House of Commons on the 1st of July 1833.

When did it take place?

It is dated the 26th of August 1833.

In point of fact there were Two Occasions only in which any Modifications were recommended by Lord Stanley?

Only Two.

The

The Question was, whether those you have mentioned were the only Two Lord Stanley recommended?

I think so. There is an important Letter of Lord Stanley in existence, which I do not possess,—it is doubtless in the Castle,—addressed to a Deputation of the Synod, which waited upon him while he was Chief Secretary; it was not addressed to us, but to a Deputation of the Synod. No Doubt that could be procured. It was with reference to that that I was examined; particularly the Meaning of the Word "School Hours."

There have been also certain Modifications in consequence of the Desire of the Synod of Ulster since that Correspondence with Lord Stanley?

Our Correspondence with the Synod of Ulster ended in their presenting certain Propositions to Government and to us; those form now Part of the fundamental Regulations of the System.

Do those Regulations comprise all which was required by the Synod?

We acceded to the whole of what they proposed. They made other Proposals at one Time, but they at length came to the Resolution of presenting the Four Propositions to which I have alluded to the Government during Earl Grey's Administration; and the Board acceded to them, and transmitted our Adoption of them.

Do they profess to be satisfied with those Concessions?

Some do; some do not.

The Question refers to the Synod of Ulster?

There were Resolutions passed the Synod of Ulster expressing Dissatisfaction with the Board in the Year 1834, I think, when it was held in Derry. A Majority of Ministers was against the Resolutions moved, which were somewhat hostile to the Board; but a Majority of the whole Synod, including the Elders, voted for them; so that the Expression of the Synod was that they were dissatisfied.

The Four Propositions which were assented to make now a fundamental Part of the Regulations of the Board?

Certainly, and we consider that we have fully and fairly and faithfully kept up to those Propositions.

Do those who are dissatisfied admit that you have adhered to these Propositions of the Synod?

They say not. We say that they are making new Stipulations not included in the Propositions; they say we have added something to the Propositions.

Do they profess to be dissatisfied with your original Concessions, as not amounting to what they demanded, or what are their Objections?

I really forget precisely the whole of them. I know that one Objection is, that we send Queries to them, whereas they expected that the Grant should be made without being required to answer Queries, but being permitted to state their own Case in their own Language.

Having made those Concessions you found you had not satisfied the Synod of Ulster by them?

We had not satisfied a considerable Portion of them.

A Majority of the Members?

A Majority, not of the Ministers, but of those who attended at a particular Meeting, including the Elders. There is an Ambiguity in the Expression Members of the Synod; the Elders are Members of the Synod for One Year only; there may be one Set of Elders this Year, and another Set next Year. In that Year in which the Synod met in Derry the Majority of the Synod, including the Elders who happened to be Members for that Year, was against the Board, and they passed the Resolutions referred to; but it does not follow from that that a Majority of the Ministers or of the Elders of the Body who are eligible to be Members of the Synod are against it.

Was there any Meeting after that that showed the Opinion of the Synod strongly against the Board?

I do not recollect that there was any Meeting of the Synod, properly so called.

Rev. J. Carlile.

There was a Meeting of about Twenty Ministers in Belfast, who were assembled as the Synod, and who came to Resolutions last Year hostile to the Board; but I do not regard them as representing the Sentiments either of the Members of Synod generally or of the Presbyterians of Ireland.

Was there ever an Attempt made to set aside that Resolution condemnatory of the Board?

It was not exactly condemnatory of the Board.

So far hostile to the Board as you have admitted?

I do not recollect that there was; but I should suggest that Information would be gained upon that Point by having the Clerk of the Synod summoned before the Committee. I cannot take upon me to answer as to all the Resolutions for or against it.

It must be an Object with the Board to conciliate that Portion of the Protestant Body comprised in the Synod of Ulster; do you conceive that you have done what you could for that Purpose?

Certainly, when we acceded to the Propositions presented by themselves.

Have you adopted any Measures in consequence of their subsequent Resolutions?

We have not; but since our Correspondence, which is already before the House, these Resolutions have not been communicated to the Board; we have no official Notice of them; we hear of them in the public Papers, and as a Member of the Synod I have Access to them.

The Opinion of the Synod, so far as it was expressed, was against the Board?

Taking the Clergymen and the Elders together, it was so. We enumerate them separately. The Majority of the Clergy was against the Resolutions, but the Majority of the whole Synod, including the Elders present, was in favour of them.

Do you mean to say that the entire Body of Elders was not of the same Opinion?

A Majority of the Elders present, not the whole Body of Elders, nor the whole of those who were present.

You referred to a Letter of Lord Hatherton's; what was the Nature of that Letter?

It was a Letter empowering us to supply the Schools with Grants of Books gratuitously.

What was the Date of it?

The Date of it was the 16th of October 1833.

When did your gratuitous Grants commence?

As soon as we had the Books printed.

Do you recollect a Discussion in the Brown Street School in Belfast?

I recollect a Discussion upon that Subject; but I would not take upon myself to recite the whole of the Circumstances of the Case.

Had it regard to the Circumstances you have just mentioned, which were discussed at Derry?

I have no Doubt the Resolutions might be referred to in the Discussion. As far as we were concerned the Brown Street School had made Application to us, and we made them a Grant, but before we had paid the Money the Application was withdrawn.

Is the Brown Street School now under the Board?

It is not.

You have now Superintendence over a considerable Number of those Schools that were formerly in connexion with the Kildare Street Society?

I think in the North of Ireland about Eighty have been reported to us as formerly having been Kildare Place Society Schools. We have not made any special Inquiry upon the Subject. I think there may be about 100, or somewhat more, over the whole Kingdom.

What is their Character; are they good or bad?

Some of them are very good; some of them quite the reverse. They are about the Average Character of the Schools of the Board.

Did you find them the reverse when you received them, or have they become so since?

We found them so. Taking the Schoolmasters and the Schools altogether, they are about the Average of our other Schools generally.

How do you proceed in preparing and examining the Scripture Extracts and other Books previous to Publication?

The Scripture Extracts are subjected to a most careful Examination. The Duty of preparing the first Draft of them devolved upon me, as they originated from my Application to Lord Stanley, already noticed. I draw out the Draft of them, placing the Authorized and the Roman Catholic Versions with the Originals before me. I draw the original Draft. They are then put in Type, and Proofs are sent to the Archbishop of Dublin and to Dr. Murray. When they have made Observations upon them, if any Alterations are suggested those are made, and new Proofs are taken off and returned to these Prelates. When they have passed through that Revision, then Proofs are sent to the whole Members of the Board. If they are satisfied with them they then go to Press. That has been usually the Course; but while the Gospel by Saint Luke was in progress, his Grace the Archbishop thought I might be relieved by having some Person to draw out the first Draft, and a Clergyman, whose Name I forget, was employed; but I did not find that Arrangement to save Time, and it was done away with. In preparing the latter Part of the Acts of the Apostles we had the Satisfaction of receiving the Assistance of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and he is now, I hope, engaged in revising the rest, in contemplation of a Second Edition, both of the Gospel by Saint Luke and the previous Part of the Acts of the Apostles. We hope to have his very valuable Assistance in issuing another Edition.

Who was the Person employed to translate that Part of the New Testament which has been printed?

That has been done as just described; it has been either originally prepared or carefully examined by myself before it has been presented to any other Member of the Board.

Are any other Books than those issued by the Board permitted to be used in the Schools?

Yes; we do not make the Use of our own Books absolutely imperative; other Books may be used, but Copies must be transmitted to us for our Examination, and if they prefer them, and we are satisfied with them, they may use them. We do not, however, give them at the reduced Price at which we grant Books issued by the Board. Before we had Books prepared by ourselves we did give other Books at the reduced Prices; among those Books which were thus sanctioned were those of the Kildare Street Society, and the Books issued by a Roman Catholic Institution, every thing of a questionable Tendency being extracted from them.

In fact it would be contrary to your Rules that any Books should be used without at least the Sanction of the Board?

Certainly.

But other Books besides your own are used?

Other Books besides our own may be used if they have the Sanction of the Board.

Are they used, in fact?

I believe that there are very few Instances of it now. In the Inspection I made of the Schools in the South of Ireland, I found occasionally Books in the Hands of the younger Children which they were reading from. The Reason given for this Practice was, that we had not given a sufficient Number of our Books. I told them it was contrary to the Rule, and must be stopped. There were but very few Schools in which such Books were found, and a very small Number of Children in each Case using them.

Rev. J. Carlile.

Have your Inspectors often reported to you Cases of a Breach of the Rule in that respect?

They occasionally have.

Often?

Taking the whole Time of our Existence, I may say often. We have uniformly put a stop to it as far as we could.

Has it not been a common Ground of Complaint on the Part of the Inspectors?

Very few Cases, comparatively, have occurred.

In the Books you sell at Half Price do you include those for separate Religious Instruction?

We do not include those for separate Religious Instruction.

Do you not recommend Books for separate Instruction?

No, we do not recommend any.

Are there not some recommended by particular Members of the Board?

There is somewhat of an Ambiguity attached to that. So far as we may be considered to recommend the Standard Books of the Church to which we belong, we may be said to recommend such Books; but I believe no Member of the Board has been called to recommend such Books. I have never been called on to recommend any particular Books; the Archbishop of Dublin tells me he has not, and Dr. Murray, I think, has said the same.

You only approve and sanction?

We have no Power over the Standard Books of any Church, and none of us has ever been called upon to approve of any other Books.

That would be Matter of private Communication between yourself and the Conductor of the particular School?

Certainly; that would never come before the Board, but privately to ourselves.

Have the goodness to look at that Return, and read the Heading of that Column?

"List of all Books or Tracts employed in the Schools in the separate Religious Instruction, with the Sanction or Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended." Then it gives a List of the Books for the Protestant Children; then it gives a List of the Books for the Roman Catholic Children. With regard to myself, I say so far as I approve of the Standard Books of the Church, I may be regarded as approving of them, but I never was called to sanction any Book for separate Religious Instruction.

You say that Dr. Murray says he was never called on to recommend any Books?

The Impression upon my Mind is that Dr. Murray merely put down those Books in that List which he considered the Standard Books for Education in his own Church.

There is another Return which has relation to the Standards; have the goodness to read that?

"The Board has not called any particular Book or Books the Standard of the Roman Catholic Church; but the Roman Catholic Members of the Board consider as such, first, the Bible with the Notes annexed, printed and published under the Sanction of the Roman Catholic Prelates, with the following Approbation:—'This new Edition of the English Version of the Bible, printed with our Permission by Richard Coin, 4, Capel Street, carefully collated by our Direction with the Clementine Vulgate, likewise with the Douay Version of the Old Testament of 1509, and with the Rhemish Version of the New Testament of 1582, and with other approved English Versions, we by our Authority approve; and we declare that the same may be used with great Spiritual Profit by the Faithful, provided it be read with due Reverence and the proper Disposition;' signed by Twenty-four Roman Catholic Bishops: secondly, the Liturgy: thirdly, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and the Summaries, edited with the Sanction of the Roman Catholic Prelates."

That

Rev. J. Carlile.

That in the Heading is called "A Statement of the Title Pages of the Books called by the Board of Education in Ireland the Standard of the Roman Catholic Church, and a Statement of the Authority on which they were so called by the Board;" that being signed by Dr. Murray?

I see that; but I cannot be answerable for what may or may not be regarded as Standards of the Roman Catholic Church by Dr. Murray. There may be an Ambiguity in the Word "Standard:" Dr. Murray may consider those as the Standards for Education. I would not take upon me to say that is the Reconciliation of the Two different Lists; what was in Dr. Murray's Mind I cannot say; but the Impression upon my Mind is that he put down the List, not having been called upon to recommend those to any particular Clergyman, but as the Works which he would consider as those held as Standard Books of Education by the Church.

Do you not consider, from that Paper you have just read, that Dr. Murray as a Member of the Board has sanctioned the Books there recommended?

Certainly; I think he has sanctioned them, being employed by Government, but not by the Board. The Board, as such, would take no Cognizance of Books for Religious Instruction. Wherever a Member of the Board of a certain Religious Persuasion, whatever it may be, has given his Sanction to certain Books which do not come under the Cognizance of the Board, I conceive it is the Government that have employed him, although they may have selected him for that Purpose because he was a Member of the Board, to do that Duty with which as a Board we have no Concern.

You mentioned that the System of the Board has met with great Opposition in Ireland?

Yes.

Can you state from what Quarter that Opposition has proceeded?

It has proceeded from various Quarters; chiefly I think from the Clergy of the Establishment; they have been the greatest Opponents to it.

Have the Prelates of the Established Church given any Opposition to it?

There was in their Names a Document issued,—whether it really came from them or not I cannot say,—but there was a Document issued with the Names of a large Number of the Bishops of the Establishment, printed in The Christian Examiner for April 1832, which was very much calculated to prevent the Clergymen of the Establishment acceding to the System.

What does the Paper profess to be?

"The undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland having taken into their Consideration, with a Solicitude due to the Importance of the Subject, the System of National Education recently proposed by His Majesty's Government for Adoption in Ireland, submit to the Clergy of their respective Dioceses the following Observations with regard to it." They are Observations on the National System of Education, and "they recommend to the Clergy of their respective Dioceses to endeavour to support the Schools now under their Management by such Means as they may themselves possess, and with such Assistance as they may be able to procure, trusting in the Blessing of Divine Providence on their humble Endeavours to work unmixed Good, even if it should be within a more confined Circle, rather than to engage in the Support of a System which is exposed to many just Objections, and which, as it should seem, cannot be carried into effect so as to secure the Co-operation of the Roman Catholic Clergy without a Compromise of Protestant Principles, and without retarding the Progress of Scriptural Knowledge which is now making large Advances in Ireland." Purporting to be signed by Seventeen, I think, of the Bishops.

What is the Date of that?

The Publication of it was in April 1832; the Paper itself does not appear to be dated.

Does it appear where it was circulated?

They say, "Since our last Number was prepared for Press we have had the heartfelt Satisfaction of seeing the Statements it contained and the Sentiments it put forward confirmed by the almost unanimous Declaration of our respected

Rev. J. Carlile.

Prelates." I cannot say where it was circulated; I have no Doubt that it had a great Influence on the Clergy of the respective Dioceses.

Are you aware whether any other Measures were taken by the Prelates individually or as a Body against the System?

There have been Petitions to Parliament from some of the Dioceses, particularly, I think, from the Diocese of Meath and the Diocese of Down; and with regard to Individuals, there was one pretty strong Case came under our Notice: the Very Rev. Dean Burgh, Dean of Cloyne, has stated that he had been enjoined, on his canonical Obedience, by the Archbishop of Tuam, to have nothing to do with our Education System; he however had Schools connected with it, and is in connexion with it now.

Did Dean Burgh state that he had been so enjoined?

I do not recollect that there was any official Communication to the Board, but I have no Doubt of the Fact?

Did you hear him state that?

I cannot precisely recollect, but I heard of it at the Time, and I doubt not that the Very Rev. Dean would be ready to give his Testimony on the Subject.

Do you know of any Measures taken by any other Individuals?

There have been several Clergymen who have attended Meetings, and made, as we conceive, rather violent and unfair Speeches against us, which have tended very greatly to prejudice many People against the Board.

Are you sure it was the Archbishop of Tuam who remonstrated with Dean Burgh?

I have no Doubt of it.

Did you hear that from the Archbishop of Dublin?

It was mentioned by the Archbishop of Dublin; I am not sure whether I heard it myself also. I hold in my Hand a Letter from a Clergyman; he signs himself as Vicar of Errigle Glebe, Aughnaclay, in which he transmits to us Resolutions that were entered into by several Landed Proprietors, in which they declare their Determination not to give Encouragement to their Tenantry who shall send their Children to Schools connected with the Board; this is a printed Copy which I have of them. The Letter came to us before the printed Copy, by which the Clergyman intimated to the Board that he was connected with it. The Resolutions communicated to us in that Letter have been printed and circulated in a Hand Bill: "We, the resident Landed Proprietors of the Parish, Errigle Trough, feel ourselves called upon to declare, 1st, That we view with Regret the practical working of the new Board of Education in this Parish; though we have ever encouraged and promoted a System in which all Denominations did willingly unite, we find our Schools opposed, a Suspicion thrown on our Motives, an unusual Disunion produced, and a rival Influence upheld which claims more than we can concede; 2d, That regarding the pure Word of God as the only Ground on which all Parties as Christians can meet, we deem it dangerous, in an Age of Irreligion and Infidelity, to throw aside that Word or even weaken its Influence; we therefore declare that none of our Tenantry will receive Encouragement from us who are opposed to Schools founded on a Religious Basis. We look for Moral and Religious Men; we value in them Knowledge with Principle, and would give a View of God's Word to the industrious and poor."

How many Names are there to that altogether?

Seven.

What is the Date of that Paper?

There is no Date upon the printed Copy; the Copies of the Resolutions are the same as the Resolutions which he transmits.

How long ago was it they were received?

I cannot say; but as much as Two or Three Years ago.

Are you aware of any other Proceedings?

There have been Proceedings on the Part of the Synod of Ulster.

Are

49

Rev. J. Carlile.

Are you aware of any Proceedings except Proceedings of Public Bodies and Public Meetings in the Synod of Laymen or Ecclesiastics?

There has been very considerable Opposition, in collecting large Meetings, and making violent Speeches against us, and there have been in some Instances Combination of Landlords to discourage their Tenantry from sending their Children to the Schools. There have been a considerable Number of Cases in which Violence was used with respect to our Schools; in one Case a Schoolhouse burnt, and in another Instance ransacked, and the Master forced out, Masters beaten, and other Acts of Violence of similar Description. I have a List of Eight or Ten Schools that have been attacked.

In what Case was the Schoolhouse burnt?

We have the whole of those Documents in Town. I have merely a Note before me of the Names. I do not see from the List in which of the Instances the Schoolhouse was burnt.

By whom was it burnt?

That I cannot exactly say.

In what County was it?

I rather think in the County of Down or the County of Antrim.

Have you heard of any Violence being offered to any other Schoolhouse beside that which was burnt?

Yes; the Windows have been broken, and the Board, "National School," taken down, and the Master threatened he would be put to Death if he did not leave the School. Things of that Kind we have heard of from Time to Time. Most of the Documents are in Town, and the Secretary will be able to state Particulars.

There was no Destruction of the House but in one Instance?

I do not recollect the absolute Destruction of the House but in one Instance.

Was there an Investigation in the Case of that Charge, whether it might not have been accidental?

There was an Investigation, and the Impression upon our Minds was that it was not accidental.

Do you recollect an Instance, about 1832, of a Resolution come to against the Schools: "27th April 1832. At a numerous and highly respectable Meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge of the County of Tyrone, Josiah Girder, Esquire, Grand Master, in the Chair, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted (inter alia): 1st. That as Protestants we reprobate the new System of National Education, and that we will not listen to any Pastor whom we see to encourage it or whom we know to approve of it?"

That was sent to us, but by whom I cannot now recollect.

Have you yourself experienced any Inconvenience or Annoyance in consequence of having acted as a Member of the Board?

I have, to a very considerable Extent. I do not complain of it as far as I am individually concerned, but I would notice it as an Illustration of the Manner in which the Board has been opposed. In the first place, I was almost immediately under the Necessity of resigning the Situation I held for a Number of Years as Secretary to the Hibernian Bible Society, being considered by some as unfit to hold Office in a Society by which the Bible was to be distributed. There were Attempts to destroy the Peace of my Congregation, which however did not succeed. I was denounced in the public Newspapers and elsewhere; I was under the Necessity of defending myself by public Controversy in Four Places at the same Time, in Dublin, Belfast, London, and Edinburgh; and I have been from Time to Time assailed with exceeding Bitterness by Ministers from their Pulpits and in public Documents. I have been denounced as an Infidel, and one that burked the Bible. My Character as a Clergyman has been assailed most fiercely; and lately a Resolution was passed by a Meeting calling itself the Synod of Ulster, the Object of which was to put me to the Alternative of leaving the Synod or leaving the Board.

Where was that made?

At Belfast.

Rev. J. Carlile.

How was the Peace of your Congregation attempted to be disturbed?
Partly by Persons corresponding with or conversing with some of my People, endeavouring to induce them to get up Meetings of Members of my Congregation, and to remonstrate with me on my being a Member of the Board.

Were those Proceedings from more than One Persuasion?
From Persons of different Persuasions.

From Ministers of the Church of England also?
Yes.

Any Prelates?
I believe not, except so far as they may have countenanced such Proceedings in others.

Do you refer to the Church of England when you say that you were assailed from the Pulpit?
I am not sure; but in Speeches I was assailed by Ministers of the Church of England.

Do you believe that was ever done by any Minister of the Church of England from the Pulpit?
I think so, but I will not take upon me to say that it was so. I think in some Instances in the North of Ireland, where Clergymen went round to plead the Cause of another Society, the Hibernian Society, it was done.

It was not by the Minister of the Parish in which the Denunciation was made?
No, I believe not.

Do you refer to the Hibernian Bible Society?
No; the Hibernian Society — the School Society.

That was a Clergyman of the Church of England?
That was a Clergyman of the Established Church of Ireland. I believe that was the Case. I have seen Reports of his Speeches.

Not of his Sermon?
No, not to my Recollection.

You read a Statement some Time ago of a Meeting of the Landed Gentry of a Parish who declared against the System of National Education, and endeavoured in a certain Degree to intimidate their Tenants; have you any other Instance of that Kind to state, or is that the only one?
It is not by any means the only one, but I cannot state all the Instances. We have had Instances in Inspectors Reports of Landlords refusing to give Ground for Schoolhouses, and otherwise opposing the Board. I have before me Letters to that Effect, received since my Arrival in London, but which perhaps it would scarcely be proper to bring forward, because we have not yet had an Opportunity of investigating the Cases by our Inspectors.

The Question related to the Combination of Landlords to influence their Tenants?
We have no avowed Instances, but many Refusals of Landlords in the same Neighbourhood. I have no Doubt there were Understandings amongst themselves on the Subject.

You made an Inspection of some Schools in 1836?
I did.

In how many Counties?
In Six Counties; the Counties of Tipperary, Clare, Limerick, Queen's County, Westmeath, and Cork.

Did you make a Report to the Board?
I did, which Report was communicated to the Government through Lord Morpeth. The Committee will obtain a fair Impression of the Views I took of those Schools if they call for that Report. I visited Seventy-five Schools.

Those

Those Counties you have referred to were not continuous, all of them; was there any special Principle on which you made the Selection? *Rev. J. Carlile.*

I think they are continuous; but I made Two Journeys, first beginning with Limerick, and the second with Westmeath.

There was no special Ground for the Selection of Counties?

None; but I went to Limerick partly that I might see the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who resides in the Neighbourhood, and from thence went on my Visitation.

Why did you make that Inspection?

It was made at the Request of the Board, and at the Expense of the Board.

Did you take particular Care to inspect those Schools concerning which the Inspectors had made Reports?

I rather preferred, when I happened to be in the Neighbourhood of those Schools of which very favourable Reports had been made, to visit them. I conceived that we might safely trust to the Inspector where he had made unfavourable Reports; that there could be very little Doubt that they spoke what they conceived to be true when they spoke unfavourably.

In general did the Schools of which you had had favourable Reports correspond with the Reports which had been made?

Upon the whole I consider the Inspectors had given fair and judicious Reports.

As your Object was principally to look into those of which you had had favourable Reports, the Committee can hardly judge from your Report of the general Character of the Schools?

I do not mean to say that I confined myself to these. Where I found myself in the Neighbourhood of a School favourably reported, I visited it; but I took the whole of the Schools in a Circle, without any particular Selection; and I have visited some of the very worst Schools we have.

You have taken a Circuit, and examined all the Schools within that Circuit?

I cannot exactly say all the Schools.

Was that your Intention?

My Intention was to inspect an Average of the Schools in those Counties; and I went from one to the other, taking what Care I could that the Managers or Teachers of the Schools should not know that I was coming.

You stated that you preferred Schools of which a favourable Report had been made?

I had a Note of the Schools of which the Inspectors had made favourable Reports, and I wished to see them, as one might suppose the Inspector biassed in favour of the System, and I supposed where they had made unfavourable Reports there was a strong Probability of their reporting fairly.

Did you visit the Schools in the City of Cork?

Yes; Two in the City of Cork, One in Cove, and others in the Neighbourhood.

Did you endeavour to ascertain for yourself the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars separately?

No, I did not enter into the Minutiæ of Inspection; I entered into the general State of the School, and asked respecting the Scripture Extracts, and examined the Class in the Scripture Extracts.

Your chief Anxiety was upon the Scripture Extracts?

Very much so. I was anxious to know how far the Scripture Extracts were received.

Did you give any special Orders about reading the Scripture Extracts?

No, certainly not; they are recommended by the Board to the Teachers and the Managers, and the Inspectors have Directions to recommend them, and to ask whether the Clergymen of any Denomination object to them; and

Rev J. Carlile.

if they do not object to them to recommend them still more strongly to the Masters, seeing that the Clergy do not object to them.

Did you make it a Rule in all the Schools you visited to give a strong Recommendation of using the Scripture Extracts?

I did so, especially towards the latter Part of the Inspection, when I felt that I could do so without exciting Suspicion. I was not aware precisely of the State of the Schools, and made my Inquiries at first with some Hesitation as to the Extracts; I was not aware whether they were really and bonâ fide used, but not meeting with any Objections to them, I gradually recommended them more earnestly.

Have you found the Scripture Extracts in fact in a great Number of Instances to have been used where there was a Report made?

In a great many during the last Year.

Did you ever obtain Reports of the Use of Scripture Extracts before?

I really cannot answer that Question, whether during the previous Year there were Reports on that Point. No separate Report has ever been given on that Subject, but in the Schedule which the Inspectors have to fill up there is a List of the Books to which they have to attach the Number of Children reading them, and among those the Scripture Extracts. My Attention was directed to those Reports of the last Year. I do not recollect whether there was a similar Report the Year before.

It could be ascertained, if it were necessary, whether they answered that Question, and what their Answers were?

Certainly.

In respect to the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in the different Schools which are assisted by the Commission, you are aware that twice the House of Lords has issued an Order for a Return of the Numbers and the Religion of the Children in the Schools?

I do not recollect that there was an Order calling for it; it may have been so. I believe it was refused by the Kildare Place Society.

In the Year 1832 there was an Order of that Kind. Have the goodness to read No. 5. in that Document, showing what was called for, and the Returns?

"Statement in all Cases of Applications for existing Schools which have been complied with, of the Number severally of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in attendance." The Answer of the Board is, "The Commissioners of Education do not make Inquiry as to the Number severally of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in attendance; the Information which they receive being as to the Attendance of Children generally, without Distinction of Religious Denominations, therefore no Return can be made in pursuance of this Order." We could not make a Return now. I have given my own private Information upon the Evidence I myself have procured, which the House may make what they think fit of, but we could not give an official Return from the Board.

You understand that the Kildare Place Society, and the Persons acting for them, have refused that Return?

I think the Secretary of the Kildare Place Society, Mr. Serjeant Jackson, did, to the House of Commons, refuse to give such a Return, as being contrary to the System.

Was there not a Return enforced from that Society?

I think not; but I cannot say precisely.

With respect to the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children given to you by the Inspectors, did you understand those were the Children whom the Inspector himself saw, or that he took the Account from the Schoolmasters.

His Direction from me was to ask the Question of Schoolmasters, or the Conductors of the School, but not to make the Inquiry public in the School.

In your general Recollection of that Multitude of Schools, do you remember the Result as to any particular Counties? *Rev. J. Carlile.*

I had the whole Memoranda here the last Day I was examined. I did not bring them To-day, not expecting to be examined on that Subject.

You stated that there were Books submitted to the Board, and sanctioned by them, beyond those published by them?

When we had no Books of our own. We were directed by the Government to receive Applications for Schools immediately, as I mentioned before, because it was necessary for Lord Stanley to be able to say whether the System in regard to its grand general Principles was likely to be received by the Country, before he should apply to Parliament for a Grant. We had then received Schools before we had Books ready for them. Books were presented to us for our Sanction. The Kildare Place Society Books were thus sanctioned, and a Set of Books that were published by a Roman Catholic Society, but which were examined, and every thing of a Nature peculiar to that Church, as far as our Inspection would enable us to do it, was expunged.

Have you any List of those Books?

I have not, but I dare say there may be in the Office.

Do any of those Books continue to be sanctioned now you have your Books and Selections printed?

They would be sanctioned, but with this Explanation, that we do not give them at reduced Prices as we do the Books which we publish. We furnish a Stock to each School of our own Books gratuitously, and when additional Supplies are required we furnish them at Half the cost Price. If they prefer those other Books at the whole Price they are at liberty to use them.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

The Witness was again called in.

Has the Board any Rule by which the Publication of any Political Pamphlet or Party Writing is forbidden on pain of Dismissal from their Service?

There is a Rule forbidding Publication on such Subjects; whether it is expressly on pain of Dismissal I cannot say; I think it amounts to that.

Have you any Objection to produce the Rules on which the Commissioners have acted?

Certainly not; I have them not with me, but we have sent for our Minute Book, and they can be got immediately, I have no Doubt.

You are the Commissioner who is considered as the Resident Commissioner, and are almost always present?

Yes.

Are the Meetings numerously attended in general?

They are pretty well attended; sometimes there are Causes of Absence for a considerable Time, as when the Duke is in attendance in Parliament, and other Causes of a similar Kind; but in general the Attendance is pretty good.

The Names appear in the Book on every Attendance?

Certainly.

How is the official Correspondence on the part of the Board managed?

The Correspondence, in mere Matters of Detail, is managed by the Secretary, but under the Superintendence of the Board. Any Letter of Consequence that requires Notice, or any new Matter, is laid before the Board, and either the Substance of the Answer is directed, or sometimes the Letter actually written is put into the Hands of the Secretary, to be copied by him.

In case of Complaints either against the Conduct of Teachers, the Conduct of Managers of Schools, or any other Matters of Complaint against the Operation of the System, how do you deal with those?

They are always brought before a full Board.

Rev. J. Carlile.

If a Complaint is made of a Party being ill-treated by the Schoolmaster or by the Manager of a School?

Those always have been brought before the Board.

When brought before the Board an Investigation takes place, if the Subject appears to be a grave one?

Certainly. The Board act according to their Judgment upon the Case. They have usually ordered an Investigation. Sometimes they have directed that the Parties should make Application to a Magistrate.

Is the Board in the habit of informing the Complainant of the Course they take to satisfy themselves of the Reasonableness or the Unreasonableness of the Complaint?

I think universally. It is possible that something of that Kind may have been omitted, but that is their Practice.

They would inform the Complainant of the Evidence adduced?

No, I do not say that. They inform the Complainant of the Directions they have given; that they have ordered the Inspectors to proceed to an Examination, and that they have come to a certain Conclusion respecting it, or whatever may be the Resolution they may have entered into. But with respect to reporting Evidence to the Complainant, that I think would depend on the Circumstances of the Case; I think there is no Rule for or against it. But that is a Duty on which we are in the habit of always consulting the legal Members of the Board, and they will be better able to inform the Committee of the Principles on which we act than I am.

In the course of the Investigation you have always given the Complainant an Opportunity of establishing his Complaint before the Persons who were directed to investigate?

Cases are so various that I really cannot state any particular Rule upon the Subject. I had rather that the Committee should examine Mr. Blake, one of our legal Members, upon this Point. We, as I have said, take the Advice of the legal Members of the Board. Such Cases have been always brought before the Board, and have been dealt with according to the best Judgment we could form upon them.

Where there has been Matter of any particular Import expected to come on before the Board, is it not usual to give Notice of it, and call the Attention of Members particularly to that Subject when the regular weekly Circulars are sent out?

Certainly; in all Cases. If there were any Case of that Kind coming forward we should inform those Members of the Board; and if they should not be able to attend we should postpone the Matter till they should be present.

What is the Course in preparing the official Documents?

There is no particular Course. The official Documents are of various Kinds. There have been Returns called for, which were necessarily referred to the Secretary, and have been prepared in his Office, and revised by us. There are other Documents which we prepare ourselves amongst us. I cannot give any precise Rule for it.

Can you produce the Estimates referred to in the Second Report of Expenditure for the Nine Years on the proposed Extension of the Operations of the Society?

There was no regular Estimate of that. I conceive it was only a prospective Sort of History of what might possibly be the Result.

You put down in this Statement the official Establishment in the first Year as to cost 4,000*l.*, and you have stated certain Sums as the probable Expense in future Years; how are those Sums arrived at?

They are arrived at by taking the present Expenditure as the Groundwork, and calculating what Increase there would probably be; but it was impossible to give a correct Estimate in such a Case.

You must have had some Data to arrive at those Conclusions; what were those Data?

They were chiefly, as I have said, forming an Opinion from our present Expenditure

Expenditure what would be the Expenditure with the supposed Extension of the System. *Rev. J. Carlile.*

You have stated that upon the Average the Schools you assisted which had been connected with the Kildare Place Society were about equal to the others?
I think those which had come to us from the Kildare Place Society, having the Kildare Place Society Masters, were upon the whole neither better nor worse than our other Schools; some are very good, some very indifferent; some very indifferent Masters, and some very good ones.

Should you be willing to specify any of the Masters?
I could get the Information, but I am not prepared to give it at this Moment.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned 'till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 7° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Right Honourable ANTHONY RICHARD BLAKE is called in, and examined as follows:

You are one of the Commissioners appointed to carry into effect the new System of National Education in Ireland?
I am.

You were one of the Commissioners of the Education Inquiry that took place in 1824, were you not?
Yes, I was.

In the Execution of that Duty you visited a great Part of the Kingdom of Ireland?
I was in each of the Provinces, and visited Schools in each.

What general Opinions did you form of the State of Education existing at that Time, and of the Principles upon which the Education of the People in Ireland should be conducted?
I thought the Education of the Poor in Ireland at that Time imperfect in many respects. The great Body of them were educated in what are called Pay Schools, which are of a very inferior Description in general. Some were educated in Schools supported in the whole or in part by Grants of Public Money. In these, in general, it was a Rule that the Scriptures should be read, without Catechism or Explanation, and to this the Roman Catholics objected. There were Schools not supported by the State, but by voluntary Subscriptions amongst the Roman Catholics, which were decidedly of a Roman Catholic Character, and into them Protestants in general of course would not go. I commenced the Inquiry with an Opinion in some degree formed as to what Sort of System ought to be established; since I have been able to think at all upon the Subject I have been convinced that it was absolutely essential to all Hope of Peace and Happiness in Ireland that you should promote a thorough and cordial Intercourse between Protestants and Roman Catholics; and I felt that, in proportion as they were educated together, and trained up with the kind Feelings of Schoolfellows towards each other, you would promote that Intercourse, and in proportion as you did so in early Life it would subsist in Manhood. I entered upon the Inquiry with that Feeling, and I was glad to find during it that in a great Proportion of the Schools, though they were, I think, defectively constructed and not well managed, there was a very considerable Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics mixed together. That satisfied me that they might be trained up in the same Schools, provided due Precautions were taken and due Guards afforded; Guards satisfactory to the Clergy of both Denominations, that there should be no undue Interference on the Point of Religion.

You formed a strong Opinion from your Experience and Observation upon that Occasion in favour of a System of combined Education?
Decidedly.

What did you find to be the Character of the Schoolmasters employed in the Schools?
I found the Character of the Schoolmasters to be of an inferior Description with respect to general Education. That of the Schoolmasters in what were called the Pay Schools appeared particularly bad, from what I could hear of them;

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

they were described as very mischievous People; they were supposed to be Persons engaged in writing inflammatory Letters and Notices, and so forth. The Schoolmasters that had been trained in the School of the Kildare Place Society I considered of a better Class; they were decent in their Appearance; I did not hear any thing to their Disadvantage; but they were not so highly trained as I think Schoolmasters should be.

They were many of them Persons of a seditious and turbulent Character?
I understood that many of the Masters of the Pay Schools were, but not those trained in the Kildare Place School.

Do you mean by Pay Schools what usually are called Hedge Schools?
They are usually called Hedge Schools.

Are they called Pay Schools because the Children pay for their own Instruction?
Yes; and they are distinguished as "Pay Schools" in the Reports which we made in 1825 and 1826.

Did you find that the Moral Character of the Schoolmasters was indifferent?
I am sorry to say that such was the Impression I received as to many at the Time.

Will you explain further what you mean by Pay Schools?
I mean by Pay Schools, Schools in which the Masters receive some small Stipend from the Children who attend them; Schools set up on private Speculation; Schools that received no Aid either from the State or from any Society established for the Promotion of Education. The Masters received 1*d.* a Week or so from the Children; sometimes more and sometimes less. The Schoolmasters, I thought, in those Schools were of a very inferior Class.

There was no Control whatever over them?
None whatever.

But in the great Majority of the Kildare Place Schools the Schoolmasters were paid by the Children, were they not?
They were; but they received certain Gratuities from the Kildare Place Society besides, and they were responsible in some degree to that Institution. I ought to say that what I have stated with respect to the Schoolmasters that I have spoken disparagingly of is the Result of Communications with Gentlemen as I went through the Country.

Not from your own Inquiry?
I visited the Schools, and I could not, as your Lordships will see, say any thing of the Moral Character of the Masters from their Appearance.

Did it strike you that those Pay Schools were of a better Description in the North of Ireland than in the South or West?
It did not; they appeared to me to be of the same Description in all the Provinces.

What was the Amount of Pay to the Schoolmasters?
It varied very much; in some Places I think it was 1*s.* or 2*s.* or more a Quarter, and in some Places 1*d.* or 2*d.* a Week.

Was the Pay as high at the Kildare Place Schools as at the others?
It was higher, I think, at the others.

Was the Pay from the Kildare Place Society gratuitous?
The Grant to the Master was gratuitous; it depended upon the Report made of his Conduct.

By whom?
By the Inspectors.

What was done by the Commissioners at that Time towards the Establishment of Schools?
We presented a Report to His Majesty in 1825, in which we recommended a Plan of National Education. We were then instructed to bring it to the Test of Experiment, and for that Purpose to establish some Schools according to the Principles

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Principles we had suggested. We had proposed that in the respective Schools there should be Two Masters, where the Extent of Attendance would warrant the Expense; that one should be a Protestant and the other a Roman Catholic; that in each School Extracts from the New Testament should be used in the common Instruction of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children; that particular Periods should be set apart for Religious Instruction; and that in the course of that Religious Instruction the Protestant Children should read the Protestant Authorized Version of the Testament, and receive such Instruction as their respective Pastors might give to them, and that the Roman Catholic Children should read a Translation of the Vulgate that had been approved of by the Roman Catholic Bishops, with Notes annexed to it. These Notes had been laid before the Commissioners, and were thought by them to be such as Protestants could not fairly object to for Roman Catholics, as there was nothing offensive in them. When we came to try the Plan it was necessary for us, in the first instance, to have Extracts from the New Testament prepared, and in preparing these Difficulties arose between the Prelates of the Established Church and those of the Roman Catholic which were of such a Nature as to render it impossible for us to proceed; we therefore made a Report upon the Subject to the Lord Lieutenant, and nothing further was then done.

Certain of the Prelates of the Establishment were upon that Commission, were there not?

No, there were not.

In 1824 you proposed, that in each School there should be Two Masters, One Roman Catholic and One Protestant; and did you propose that there should be Extracts from the New Testament read in the Authorized Version by the Protestants, and in the Roman Catholic Version by the Roman Catholics?

No; we meant that the same Extracts should be read by both. My own Hope was, that we could make Extracts mixing the Versions, and that there would not be much Difficulty in doing so, but we found, as I stated, Difficulties which were then insuperable.

You had laid it down in trying the Experiment, after having reported to the Lord Lieutenant that the Book of Extracts from the Scriptures was an essential Object?

We originally laid that down.

And failing in that essential Object you abandoned the Plan?

Exactly so.

Do you recollect what were the Reasons that came from each of the Two Classes of Prelates to whom you refer which produced the Difficulty?

We got a Harmony, I think, speaking to the best of my Recollection, which was exclusively from the Protestant Authorized Version; that Harmony was sent to the Roman Catholic Prelates, and it was rejected by them. A long Examination of the Roman Catholic Archbishop then took place, in order to ascertain whether we could mix the Versions. There was a great deal said pro and con upon that. Some Answers appeared to lead to the Conclusion that we could not mix them; others seemed to lead to the Conclusion that we could. The Result was, that the Commissioners thought upon the whole that they might still indulge the Hope of having Extracts approved of by the Two Churches. The Prelates of the Established Church were then requested, if I recollect rightly, to prepare for us such Extracts as they thought would be the most proper; they did so. The Extracts they prepared were in Chapter and Verse, and were taken from the Protestant Authorized Version exclusively. We sent them to the Roman Catholic Bishops, and they rejected them. In the meantime, seeing the Difficulties which were working, it occurred to me to attempt a Compilation myself. I accordingly prepared a Harmony from the Four Gospels, which I entitled "Christian Lessons." It was my Intention, if the Work were approved of, to extend it considerably, and to add a Table of References to the Parts of Scripture from which the Lessons were taken. I may observe, that after I had put it together it was submitted to Lord Grenville, for whom I felt a particular Reverence in every possible Sense of the Word, and he expressed high Approbation of it; I recollect he wrote that he had

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

had read it with great Satisfaction; that he thought the Summary of our Lord's Teaching was particularly striking; that it showed that "never Man spake as He spake;" adding a Wish that it were in the Hands of grown-up Persons as well as Children, so that we might all become learned in the great Points on which we are agreed as well as on the Points in which we differ. I think I am giving nearly Lord Grenville's Words. Mr. Frankland Lewis was the Person who laid the Work before him; it was then sent by Mr. Lewis to the present Primate of Ireland in Print. It had been printed that it might be the more easily read, and it was without References, as they were reserved until it should be finally settled. The Primate seemed surprised that the Work should be sent to him printed; he seemed to suppose, I think, that we had made up our Minds upon it; and as it was without any References to the Scripture, he spoke of it, I think, as if it might be considered a mere Moral Essay. He wrote to this Effect, to the best of my Recollection, to Mr. Lewis; and Mr. Lewis then, by Letter, explained to him the Object with which it was printed, and stated that it would be enlarged, and adding that a Table of References was to be added to it. The Work was afterwards submitted to the whole of the Prelates of Ireland by the Primate, and they disapproved of it; they did not think it sufficiently full. In the meantime I communicated with Dr. Murray upon it, and he did not object to it; but unfortunately it did not meet the Views of the Prelates of the Established Church.

Did they give any other Reason besides its not being sufficiently full?

I think they stated that it was not composed fairly, but without pointing out any thing unfair in it; and I can positively aver that I put it together with the utmost Anxiety to make it perfectly fair. I must add that I had Reason to believe that a very eminent Prelate of the Established Church in England had pronounced a favourable Opinion upon it to Lord Grenville. It speaks however for itself; it is in Print; it appears in the Ninth Report of the Commissioners of that Day; but the Table of References was never added to it, as it was never finally settled.

Do your References refer as much to the English Testament as to the Douay?

More than Nine Tenths of it, I think I may say, was taken from the English Authorized Protestant Version.

Was that Work ever put before the Roman Catholic Bishops?

Yes, it was.

Did they express any Opinion upon it?

Dr. Murray expressed an Opinion favourable to it on their Behalf.

To the Commissioners?

He expressed it either in a Letter to the Commissioners or in some other Communication.

The "Christian Lessons" in that Report which is now handed to you are the Compilation of which you are speaking?

Yes.

Are those "Christian Lessons" given in the Words of the Scriptures?

I should say that more than Ninety-nine Hundredths of them are.

It does not profess to be entirely Scripture?

No; as it stands it is merely headed "Scripture Lessons;" but there was to be put to it a Preface stating that it was an Abstract from the Scriptures.

It does not express, and it would not in fact truly express, that it was entirely scriptural?

No; but such Passages as are not given in the Words of Scripture are given in Italics; for instance, the First Lesson states shortly the Substance of the Promises made as to the coming of our Lord; and it is given in Italics, thus: "*When our First Parents, Adam and Eve, forfeited the Garden of Eden by Disobedience, and entailed the Guilt of Sin upon their Descendants, the Lord in His Mercy promised that in Time One should be born of a Woman by whom Sin should be overcome. This Promise He renewed to Abraham when He said, 'In thy Seed all the Nations of the Earth shall be blessed.' To David it was revealed*

61

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

revealed that He who had been promised to Abraham his Forefather should be of his Line; that He should reign over all the Nations of the Earth, and that His Kingdom should have no End. From this Time the Jews spoke of the Holy One whom they expected as 'the Messias' or 'Christ.' It was foretold that He should be born of a Virgin, that Bethlehem in Judea should be the Place of His Birth, and that a Messenger should go before Him to prepare the Way of the Lord." Then come the Lessons from the New Testament, commencing with the Words of St. Paul: "Now, when the Fulness of Time was come, God sent forth His Son Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the World, and the Promise of His coming was in this wise." What immediately follows is taken from St. Luke.

In those Cases where the actual Words of Scripture are used, is there a Reference to the Text?

It was my Intention to have added a Table of References throughout, as I have already mentioned.

But there was no Reference in the Work itself?

No; it was never completed.

When the Work would have been finished you meant to have had an Index of Reference?

Yes; and that your Lordships will find stated in the Second Letter that was addressed to the Primate by Mr. Lewis.

Will you have the goodness to see whether there is any Statement in that Report of the Approbation by Dr. Murray of that Work?

Here is a Letter from Dr. Murray to Mr. Frankland Lewis, dated the 20th of December 1826; it is given in Page 20 of the Report, and I find this Passage in it:—"A Work, however, abstracted substantially from the Scripture, but not purporting to be the Words of Holy Writ, (such as that to which I had the Honour to allude in my Letter of July last,) would not be liable to the same Objection; and in this View of the Subject the Prelate already referred to" (meaning the then Archbishop of Dublin) "seems to coincide. For in his Grace's Answer to the Question of the Commissioners, No. 59, the Admissibility of such a Book appears to be recognized, provided it 'be not put forward as the Scriptures, but as an Historical View of what is found in the Scriptures.' Here then, perhaps, a Point of Union may be found, and the only practicable Way can be come at, whereby the Prelates of the Roman Catholic and of the Protestant Church may, without a Sacrifice of Principle, be led to agree in the Adoption of a Book such as the Commissioners desire for the Purpose of general Instruction. The Roman Catholic Prelates have seen a Book entitled "Christian Lessons," which is a Compilation of this latter Description. It contains nearly the whole Matter of the former Work, taken from the Roman Catholic and Protestant Translations, where they substantially agree, but it gives the Matter as an Historical Statement rather than as a Transcript of Scripture. I have made some trifling Alterations in this Book (an amended Copy of which I have the Honour to send herewith), and though it is not yet all that we could wish, I am instructed to say that the Roman Catholic Prelates would not think themselves called on to discourage the Attendance of Children of the Roman Catholic Faith in any School in which the Use of this Compilation, so amended, might be required, provided the Regulations of said School were in accordance with the Resolutions of the Roman Catholic Prelates, which I had the Honour to transmit to the Commissioners on the 23d of January last."

You will perceive that Dr. Murray in that Letter speaks of a Book entitled "Christian Lessons," "which is a Compilation of this latter Description." The latter Description is "a Work abstracted substantially from the Scripture, but not purporting to be the Words of Holy Writ." You agree that that is the latter Description so referred to?

His Words are "a Transcript of Scripture." My Object was to give the Matter in the Two Translations, Protestant and Roman Catholic, faithfully. As for giving the very Words of the Scripture, it should be remembered that none of us give the original Words, but only an English Translation of them. Instead, therefore, of saying, "Our Saviour spoke the following Words," the

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Expression in this little Work is, "Our Saviour taught to the following Effect." Then our Lord's Discourses are given nearly through the whole Work in the Words of the Protestant Version. The Course I took was this:—I first gave the History of our Lord's Life to the Time of His Baptism; then of our Lord's teaching, showing where He taught literally, and where in Parables; then His Miracles; then His going up to Jerusalem, His Sufferings, and His Resurrection; that was the Plan of the Work. For instance, I began it thus:—"*After our Lord's Baptism,*" having first given the Work up to that Period, "*He commenced His Public Ministry;*" that I marked in Italics, as it was not taken literally from the Scriptures. Then I went on in the Words of Scripture:—"And He went about all Galilee, teaching in the Synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of Sickness and every Infirmity among the People; and He taught as one having Authority, and not as the Scribes." Then is added, being marked in Italics, as my own, "*And He taught sometimes in plain Discourse, and sometimes in Parables, and He taught to the following Effect.*" Then I gave His Lessons under separate Heads: "Who are blessed," "Against Malice," "Wrong should be borne patiently," and so on.

Will you have the goodness to read the whole Letter to yourself?
[The Witness reads the Letter.]

What do you understand by the Expression, "this latter Description"?
I take it to be a Work not put forward as the Scripture, but as an Historical View of what is found in the Scriptures.

Then you understand Dr. Murray as assenting to the Scripture Lessons as a Work of that Description?
I do.

Does not that Letter show that Dr. Murray, as well as the Primate, did not know any thing about the Reference; but that when Dr. Murray approved of this, he approved of it in the Sense of its not professing to be the Scripture?
No; I consider the contrary; he meant that it was to be considered as stating the Substance of Scripture, but not as a Transcript of Scripture. The References would show that the Matter was taken from Scripture, though the Language was not so throughout.

Coming within the Description you have already given, a Work not put forward as the Scripture, but as an Historical View founded upon the Scripture?
Yes; but he was aware that there would have been a Table of References which would have shown the Parts of Scripture from which it was taken.

Do you consider that the Approbation of Dr. Murray contained in that Letter was because it did not profess to be Scripture, but substantially in its Matter Scripture?
I understood him to approve of it because, though it was not in the Words of his approved Version, yet it substantially agreed with that Version, and was not put forward as a Transcript of Scripture.

You understood him there as approving of this because it did not contradict his Version, and was not put forward as Scripture?
Not as the very Words of Scripture.

You draw a Distinction between a Passage in the Harmony being the Words of Scripture, and professing to be the Words of Scripture, because, as you understood Dr. Murray's Objection, it was to the Use of Words where they professed to be the Words of Scripture?
He does not here state an Objection on that Ground, though his Words may imply one. I understand him to say, I approve of that Work because, though it differs in some degree from the Roman Catholic Authorized Version, yet it is not put forward as the Scriptures; it is put forward as a substantial Statement of them.

The Letter says, "All the Prelates fully agree in the Propriety of the Objection urged by the Roman Catholic Archbishops against putting into the Hands of Catholic Children as Scripture any Book which is not conformable to

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

to their own authorized Version, and it is satisfactory to them to observe that the Validity of this Objection is supported by the Testimony of his Grace the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, as appears in your Report of his Grace's Examination." In his Grace's Answer to the Question No. 52. "the mischievous Consequences to be apprehended from putting before a Child as Scripture a Book of any Form which should not be exactly conformable to the Translation approved by his Church are stated so much at large that it would be quite superfluous to add a Word to the Train of Reasoning pursued by his Grace. On this Principle, which seems to be common to Roman Catholics and Protestants, we feel it our reluctant Duty to declare that the Work which you did me the Honour to submit to my Perusal, that is, the Harmony, cannot, unless the Plan on which it is constructed be wholly changed, obtain our Sanction as a Book of general Instruction, to be used in Schools wherein Catholic Children receive their Education. It purports to present to Catholic Children the inspired Word of God, and yet it differs from the Translation which those Children are taught to consider authentic. There is Evidence before your Board that the Prelates of the Protestant Church would object to a similar Work if constructed solely from the Douay Version, and the Commissioners will not, I trust, deem it unreasonable that we should, on the same Grounds, entertain a conscientious Objection to the Work in question." That Passage having been read, how do you reconcile with that Passage the Statement made in the Third Report of the Commissioners in these Words, in Page 13: "This Letter is given in the very Report from which the Author purports to quote; yet with it before him he states that he believed the Roman Catholic Commissioners would admit of nothing but the Douay Version; and because Dr. Murray approves of the Extracts which we are now publishing, and which are not taken either from the Protestant Version or the Roman Catholic Version exclusively, but are an original Compilation avowedly made by ourselves upon a Comparison of the Protestant and Douay Versions with the Original;—because Dr. Murray approves of this Work,—a Work conformable to the Views expressed in his Examination and in his Letter,—he is charged with Perjury! and, as if this were not enough, the Author intimates that he will never again believe a Roman Catholic Bishop upon his Oath. This is beyond Comment"?

The Letter now referred to is not the Letter set forth in the Report, but I see no Difficulty whatever in reconciling the Report with it. Dr. Murray stated that the Roman Catholic Bishops objected to putting any Work as Scripture into the Hands of Children which was not conformable to their own authorized Version. Now the standard Version of the Roman Catholic Church is the Vulgate, and Dr. Murray has approved of our Scripture Lessons as conformable to it.

The Committee find this Passage in Page 41 of the Ninth Report. A Question is put to Dr. Laffan: "Having heard the Questions put to Dr. Kelly, and the Answers given by him, will you state your own View of the Subject?—I certainly think the Plan of the Commissioners would be more extensively beneficial for the Purpose proposed if the Schools should be so arranged that the Catholic Children should hear no Portion read out of the Scriptures except in a Version completely their own, not only in Sense and Meaning but likewise in Words, and that is what I meant last Night by being conformable; I meant conformable even in Words. The Douay Version is pretty much what I may call the Vulgate for the Laity." Having heard that Passage read, do you still persist in the Answer which you have given?

I persist in the Answer, for I recollect the general Tenor of the Examination in question (the Examination of the Roman Catholic Archbishops); and I speak with reference, not to isolated Passages, but to the whole of it. I am sure it was distinctly stated by Dr. Kelly and Dr. Murray, that to an Harmony which conformed to the Vulgate they could not object. I am pretty certain that Dr. Kelly in his Examination stated that, and that Dr. Murray agreed with him. Dr. Kelly's Evidence will be found in Page 38 of the Report, and his Words are, "It is my Opinion, that in order to make a Harmony acceptable to the Catholics it will be necessary, not only that particular Passages, but that the whole of the Translation, shall be in conformity with the Vulgate." He was then asked, "Do you mean the Latin Vulgate or the English Douay?"

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

His Answer was, "The Translation we approve of is the English Douay; another Translation may hereafter be proposed, but it cannot be approved of by us unless it is in perfect Conformity with the Vulgate." Then another Question was put to him. He was asked, "Still, assuming that the Authorized Version should be altered in all the Places in which it is not a faithful Translation of the Vulgate, would it then, having received those Alterations, be in your View admissible as a Harmony in Question?" His Answer was, "Without a Reference to the Authorized Translation I should compare the Translation with the Vulgate." Then Dr. Murray, who had answered before with reference to the Douay Version, was questioned again by the Commissioners; and I beg to read to your Lordships his Examination; it is given in Page 38. "Is there any thing in Dr. Kelly's Answers that appears to you to alter the View of the Subject as taken by you?—No." "Does not it appear to you to admit of blending the Two Versions which you appeared to consider as inadmissible?—No; wherever the Vulgate is attended to we cannot object to it." Now I understand that the Vulgate has been carefully attended to in making the Translation which we have published. I have taken very little Part, scarcely interfered at all, in forming it; the Extracts are prepared by Mr. Carlile, and then submitted to the Members of the Board. Dr. Murray satisfies himself, as I understand, that they are in conformity with the Vulgate, and gives his Sanction.

This Passage proceeds thus:—"Do not you think there are many Parts of the Authorized Version that (as fairly as one Language can render the Meaning of another) follow the Translation of the Vulgate?—Yes; and wherever it is conformable to the Vulgate I should not object to it in a Harmony." Will you state whether the Harmony does not make that Distinction, that it is not given as Scripture?

I should not so consider. Dr. Murray says a little farther on, "If you give it as Scripture, it must agree with the Vulgate." I ought too to state, that when His Majesty's Government originally communicated with the Members of our Board, it was not proposed that we should use Extracts from the Scriptures, nor was it suggested by the Committee of the House of Commons, at whose Recommendation the Board had been formed. After the Plan had been opened to us, in order that we might say whether we would act as Commissioners or not, and after we had given a general Assent, Mr. Carlile spoke to me about introducing Extracts from the Scriptures into the Schools. I recollect saying to him, that I thought he would find very great Difficulties in his Way, if he attempted that; but that it was a Point on which I should be governed by Dr. Murray. Mr. Carlile then communicated with Dr. Murray, and the Result was, that Dr. Murray expressed himself willing to assent to a Compilation which should not be taken from the Protestant Authorized Version or the Douay exclusively, provided it was conformable to the Vulgate. Such a Work, if he approved of it, he felt would go forth under his Sanction to the Roman Catholics, and the Difficulty before in the Way of such a Publication would be at an end. Mr. Carlile of course communicated with the other Members of the Board, and finally undertook the Selections now in use. The Difficulties that I apprehended would arise did not, as the Differences between the Two Versions proved to be very immaterial.

Will you attend to this Passage, which immediately follows that which has been cited?—"Is it not your Impression that in Ninety-nine Parts out of a Hundred the Authorized Version is as faithful a Translation of the Vulgate as the Douay itself is?—If you give those Passages as Part of a Harmony, there can be no Difficulty about it, provided they do not purport to be the Words of Scripture which the People are accustomed to see." The next Question is, "If a Harmony were formed, which Harmony should be strictly conformable to the Vulgate, would the Circumstance of its being conformable also to the Authorized Version be an Objection to it?—No, certainly not; give it as a Harmony, and not as the Gospel, and there can be no Difficulty about it." Does not that make the Distinction between giving it as a Harmony and giving it as the Gospel? and do you understand from this Passage that the Distinction made by the Roman Catholic Bishops here is, that it is lawful for them to do it,—giving it as a Harmony, but not in the Words of the Gospel?

I could not understand it in that Sense, knowing, as I do, what the Law of the

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

the Roman Catholic Church is upon the Subject; knowing that the standard Version of the Roman Catholic Church is the Vulgate, and that upon no other has the Church at large ever pronounced an Opinion. The Vulgate is as much the authorized Version of the Roman Catholic Church as the English Protestant Version is that of the Established Church here. There is no English Translation of the entire Bible, I think, that has received a sort of general Approval from Roman Catholics, except the Douay, nor has it ever received the Sanction that the Vulgate has. In point of fact, there are in use among the Roman Catholics Three or Four Translations, I believe, of the Scriptures, which do not strictly follow the Douay Translation, that is to say, literally, throughout. The Roman Catholic Archbishop Crolly, who is the Archbishop for Armagh, has published a Translation of the Scriptures himself, which differs in some Places in Words from the Douay; but all must conform to the Vulgate; that is the Standard.

Will you now attend to another Passage, in Page 40?—"Suppose, for the sake of Discussion, that the Commissioners now, taking, not an English Translation into their Hands, but the Latin Vulgate, were to make what they should consider to be a Harmony by a Translation from it, would that be objected to as a Work to be put into the Hands of Roman Catholic Children?—Certainly not; if given in the Words of Scripture, it must be according to our Translation." "Suppose the Commissioners simply published a Work which they should call 'The Life of Christ,' and which Work should be substantially a Translation of the Latin Vulgate, but which should not declare in the Title Page whether it were taken from the Scriptures or not; would there be any Objection to that?—Not if they are not given as the Words of Scripture; if they are given in the Words of Scripture, whether called so or not, they must be in the Words of our Douay Version." How can you reconcile that?

I do not myself see the Difficulties to be reconciled which are implied in the Questions put to me. The Answer now read was given by Dr. Curtis. He spoke of the Douay as the then recognized Translation of the Vulgate; but he said distinctly, in answering another Question, "If on some future Occasion there should be a better Translation of the Vulgate than the Douay one, we may take it." Now the Work which we have put forward is an original Translation, as is distinctly stated in the Preface; and it has been approved of by a competent Authority of the Roman Catholic Church, by Dr. Murray, as a faithful Translation of the Vulgate.

In Page 37 there is this Passage:—"Dr. Murray will recollect one particular Expression in that Minute, that no Difficulty would arise in the arranging of this Harmony on the Part of the Roman Catholic Clergy; the Commissioners wish to know whether the making it a Sine quâ non that the Harmony should be compiled from the Douay Version of the Scriptures in omnibus appears to be in accordance with that Statement?—I expressed that as my Opinion, without foreseeing all the Difficulties which have since arisen." Will you state how you reconcile that?

I can only give the Answer that I gave before; the Difficulties implied in the Questions put to me are not felt by me. A Variety of Questions were put to Dr. Murray in the course of a long and rambling Examination, as to Works that might be thereafter put forth. He stated that he could not agree to any Work going forth as a Translation of the Scriptures, unless it was approved of as conformable to the Vulgate. There was no Translation then except the Douay that was in general Use as conformable to it; and he spoke entirely with reference to that State of Things, showing that if a Translation were made that the Roman Catholic Church approved of as conformable to the Vulgate no Difficulties would exist as to it. Your Lordships must all, I am sure, feel that it is very difficult at any Time to give Answers with reference to the Bearing of a lengthened Examination, when your Attention is called only to a particular Question or a particular Answer; you should see how the Contest bears, and look at it as a whole. The Impression on my Mind, from the whole of the Examination in question, was, that we might put forward a Work that would afford Scriptural Instruction to the People, and put it forward stating that it was taken from the Scriptures. When the present Commission proceeded to act this View of the Subject was taken also by

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Mr. Carlile; he proposed making a new Translation. Dr. Murray said he would make no Objection, provided that in essentials it was in strict conformity with the Vulgate.

Do the Committee understand you rightly as saying that the Scripture Extracts as put forward by the Board are now an authorized Version by the Church of Rome in Ireland?

They are authorized by Dr. Murray, and they have been received without Reclamation, which I believe is a common Phrase known in the Canon Law, by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and as such I therefore consider them now authorized.

You have stated that they have been received without Reclamation, to use a Word known in the Canon Law; will you direct your Attention to the Meaning of that in the Canon Law? Is it not in reference to something put forward by the Pope, and that when put forth by the Pope, a Bull or a Doctrinal Declaration, if it does not meet with Reclamation on the Part of the Roman Catholic Bishops, throughout the Roman Catholic Country is recognized as binding; is not that the Sense of the Word Reclamation in the Canonical Law?

I understand the Rule as to Reclamation to be, that what you do not object to you are considered to have acquiesced in. In that Way I use the Phrase. The Roman Catholic Bishops do not object to the Use of those Scripture Extracts; they are used with their Consent throughout Ireland, and they have therefore, I consider, received their Sanction.

Then you consider that the hearing without Reclamation of a Work put forth by an individual Roman Catholic Bishop amounts to an Acceptance of that Work on the Part of the Roman Catholic Bishops of the Country in which it is put forth?

With the sincerest Deference I beg leave to say that I have neither expressed nor meant to express any such Thing. I have spoken with reference to a particular Work; that particular Work has been put forth in Ireland under the immediate Sanction of a Roman Catholic Archbishop; it has been adopted in Schools throughout Ireland, over many of which the Roman Catholic Bishops exercise Control; and I consider that, inasmuch as they have not declared against it, but on the contrary have allowed it to be generally used, they have given their Sanction to it. I should be very sorry to answer abstract Questions, and I hope your Lordships will not require me to do so. Your Lordships will recollect that a Person who has, as it were, to reason upon his Oath, is not quite on a Par with one who is reasoning not upon his Oath. I am in a manner sworn to my Logic.

Then you consider, with respect to this Work, that the Non-reclamation by the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland amounts to an authorized Acceptance by them?

I have stated that I consider the Non-reclamation of it, and the Adoption of it in Schools under their Direction, to amount to a tacit Approval of it.

Do you consider what you have now stated to amount to an authorized Acceptance of the Work by the Roman Catholic Clergy?

I do.

You have been a constant Attendant upon the Commission of which you are a Member?

I have given as constant Attendance as other Avocations have allowed me to give.

You are familiar with all its Proceedings?

I think I am.

And have you heard the Objections to its working?

I have.

What are the principal Objections that you have heard made to it?

I have heard it objected to on the Supposition that it excluded the Scriptures, that it enforced the reading of our Scripture Extracts, that the Masters were Persons of a low Description, that the Schoolhouses were bad, and that the Priests possessed too much Power over them. I think these are the Objections that I have generally heard.

What

67

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

What strikes you to be the Force of those Objections, and the Answers to be given to them?

We do not exclude the Scriptures; we do not enforce the reading of our Scripture Extracts; we have been urgent for Funds that would enable us to procure better Masters and better Schoolhouses than we have in many Places; and the Priests have no more Power over our Schools than the Protestant Clergy may have, if they think proper. As to the Scriptures, the reading of them is recommended in the Preface to the First Number of our Extracts; and our Rules expressly say, "the reading of the Scriptures is considered a Religious Exercise, and as such is to be reserved for the Time of Religious Instruction," thus recognizing it as a Practice that is then to take place. But it has been said, "You do not authorize the Scriptures to be read during the School Hours;" that again is a Mistake. We do authorize the Scriptures to be read during the School Hours; but during the Time that the Scriptures are read Children are not to be compelled to attend, if their Parents do not direct that they shall do so. Whenever the reading of the Scriptures is desired, we require that a certain Time shall be appointed for it; and in order that that may be a convenient Time, we wish it to be at the Beginning or at the Close of the School Hours, so that those Children whose Parents may not wish them to be present may either not come until that Exercise is over, or, having come, may go away before it is begun. In order to show your Lordships that what I now state is not a new Construction which I am putting upon our Rules, I beg to read to your Lordships a Letter addressed in the Year 1833, by our Direction, to a Presbyterian Minister who applied to us for Information as to what he might do with respect to reading the Scriptures. This Letter is signed by our Secretary, but it was in fact written by me, and approved by the Board. Your Lordships will observe that it was written in the Year after we commenced acting.

"Sir, "Education Office, 25th July 1833.

"I had the Honour of submitting to the Commissioners of Education your Letter of the 16th Instant, in which you desire to know whether Aid can be extended by them towards the Temple Meeting House School, the Business of which you state to be conducted in the following Manner; that it opens at Ten o'Clock and closes at Three; that the Attention of the Pupils until Two each Day is confined to the usual Literary Education; that the Books used by the Children are those formerly supplied by the Kildare Place Society; that the last Hour is employed in reading and Instruction in the Holy Scriptures, by such Pupils as are advanced to an Old and New Testament Class, if permitted by their Parents to join in such an Exercise; that those who are not so advanced, or who are not allowed by their Parents to read the Word of God, may either pursue the usual Routine of Business of the School, or retire if they please; and that Saturday is employed in directing the Attention of those who have not entered a Scripture Class to what they may have been doing during the Week, and in catechising those who have, in their Knowledge of the Scriptures. The Commissioners having considered your Letter desire me to state that the Regulations of the Temple Meeting House School appear to them to agree in Principle with those by which they are governed. The Rule that the Hour from Two till Three of each Day, except Saturday, should be employed in reading and Instruction in the Holy Scriptures, is quite compatible with the Regulations of the Commissioners, provided that such Children only as are directed by their Parents to attend be then allowed to continue in the School, and that all others do then retire; and with respect to the Exercise on Saturday, it also is compatible with their Rules, provided that those Children only shall attend upon that Day whose Parents direct that they shall join in reading or receiving Instruction in the Holy Scriptures, so that an Opportunity be thus afforded for all others to receive such Religious Instruction at that Time as their Parents or Guardians shall provide for them. As you mention that you occasionally visit the School, to mark the Progress, and administer such Instruction as the Circumstances and Capacity of the Children may require, the Commissioners desire me to observe that it is of the Essence of their Rules that Religious Instruction should be given only at the Time specifically appointed for that Purpose; and that Children whose Parents do not direct them to be present at it should previously retire. The Commissioners

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

having thus explained their Views, and anticipating that you will conform to them, direct me to signify their Readiness to make a Grant towards the Support of the Temple Meeting House School, on your returning the Paper which I herewith transmit, properly filled and signed.

"I have the Honour to be, Sir,
"Your most obedient Servant,
(Signed) "THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary."

By whom is the Religious Instruction which is mentioned in that Letter to be on Saturday contemplated by the Board to be given?

The Board leave that entirely to be arranged by the Parents of the Children; of course we presume that they will act in communication with their Pastors.

Then you consider that the whole of the Religious Instruction contemplated to be given on Saturday is to be given by the Religious Pastors or by the Persons whom the Parents may choose for that Purpose?

Just so.

And not by the Master of the School?

No, unless he should be chosen for that Purpose by the Parents or the Pastors.

You at first made use of the Expression, that the Religious Instruction was chosen "by the Parents," and afterwards you said, "by the Pastors"?

I said by the Parents, who we presume act in communication with their Pastors. No Master should have a Right to direct that any Child should attend whose Parents do not think proper that he should do so.

By what Regulation do the Commissioners authorize the Scriptures to be used in School Hours, with the Proviso that has been mentioned?

We state, I think, in our Regulations, that the reading of the Scriptures we consider a Religious Exercise, and that it should take place at the Time appointed for Religious Instruction. We require that there should be a sufficient Portion of each Day allotted for general Literary Instruction, and an Opportunity afforded for Religious Instruction.

Will you read the Regulation in the Instruction to the Inspectors?

This is the Regulation: — "In all Schools receiving the ordinary Rate of Salary, aided by the Commissioners, a certain Number of Days, at least Four in each Week, and certain Hours, at least Four in each Day, are understood to be set apart for Moral and Literary Education, during which Children of all Denominations are to be educated together. During these Hours no Book inculcating or countenancing peculiar Views of Religion is to be used. As the Holy Scripture is itself unhappily a Subject of Controversy in this Country, both in regard to the Books which constitute Scripture and to the Translation of it, and as the Introduction of the Bible into Schools for common Education has created much Contention and Dispute, and prevented a very large Proportion of the poorer Classes of Ireland from sending their Children to Schools receiving Government Aid, it is not to be introduced during the Hours set apart for common Education, but every Facility is to be given for the reading and explaining of the Scriptures either before or after these Hours, that is to say, the Hours of common Instruction, or for any other Mode of communicating Religious Instruction by such Pastors or other Persons as are approved by the Parents or Guardians of the Children. One Week Day at least is to be set apart for Religious Instruction, under the same Restriction, namely, that it be given by Instructors approved of by the Parents or Guardians of the Pupils."

Is that the Regulation to which you allude as giving the Authority for the Scriptures to be read in School Hours?

Yes. I state that the reading of the Scriptures during One of the School Hours is not inconsistent with our Rules, if done in the Way I have mentioned; and I have shown your Lordships that this View of the Subject is not now taken for the first Time, for that it was taken and declared so long ago as in 1833.

Right Hon A. R. Blake.

You will bear in mind that you said, "We do authorize the Scriptures to be used in School Hours, with that Proviso." This is the Regulation upon which you consider you are justified in authorizing the Scriptures to be so used?

That is the Rule upon the Subject.

Do you consider the Term "School Hours" as applicable to no other Hours but the Four Hours which you have stated to be devoted to Moral and Literary Instruction?

I do not. I consider that the School Hours may be Five, Six, or Seven Hours. A sufficient Time must be set apart for giving to the Children Moral and Literary Instruction, so that those Parents who do not wish Religious Instruction to be given to their Children in the Schools may thus have the Benefit of it for those other Purposes; but this being done, as large a Portion of Time as is thought right may be given to Religious Instruction.

Do you think that any Perplexity has arisen from an Ambiguity in the Use of the Expression "School Hours," from it being sometimes taken in one Sense and sometimes in another?

Such Difficulties have arisen.

Has the Purport of the Letter that was sent to the Minister of the Synod of Ulster been communicated in any general Notice throughout the Country?

The Synod of Ulster in 1833 sent Proposals to the Commissioners, which appeared to me to suggest in effect the same Practice as that of the Meeting House School about which we had been written to; we were desired to state our Opinion upon them, and we stated in answer that we had examined them, that we did not think them inconsistent with our Rules, and that we should be prepared to make Grants accordingly, upon having such Queries as we deemed necessary satisfactorily answered; our Meaning being to ascertain by the Answers to our Queries whether the Applicants would act in a Way consistent with our Principles. We have thus, I consider, given public Notice, that we do consider that the Scriptures may be used in the Way mentioned in the Letter I have read. As the Letter itself was written in answer to a particular Application, it was not originally published, but it was last Year, with our Reports and other Documents. The Correspondence between us and the Synod of Ulster has been, I think, laid before Parliament, and thus Publicity has been given to it.

But in no formal Document has the Board announced any such Regulation in Munster, Connaught, or Leinster?

I think the Board does announce it in its printed and published Rules. We have never considered it necessary to give any particular Explanation beyond these, unless where a particular Question has been put, because we consider that the Rules speak for themselves. The Board never felt any Difficulty upon the Subject; the Board has always understood its Rules in the Way I have now expressed them.

Is it the Fact, as to authorizing the Scriptures to be read in School Hours, with this Proviso, that there is nothing in the Regulation of the Board which would contradict it, neither would there be if any other special Religious Instruction were in like Manner given in School Hours, with the same Proviso?

Most certainly not.

Do you consider that there is any Distinction between the Use of the Term authorizing and directing?

It makes the whole Difference. I would not be Party to directing any particular Religious Instruction so as to enforce it on all, for Conscience should be left free; but neither would I object to any Religious Instruction being given that the Parents of Children procure for them, provided it were founded upon the Principles of Christianity. We have no Right at all,—no Power whatever is given to us,—to prohibit any Religious Instruction; but I have no Hesitation in saying that I understand by Religious Instruction such only as shall be of a Christian Character.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Then in fact, according to the Regulation of the Board, any Religious Instruction, whether in the Roman Catholic Religion or any other, may be given in the School Hours, with the Proviso that has been mentioned?

With the Proviso that no Children shall be compelled to be present.

That is, Religious Instruction founded upon Christianity?

Yes, founded upon Christianity, and that should be given at a convenient Hour of the Day, so that the Children whose Parents may not wish them to be present shall not be bound to attend. The Correspondence with the Synod that I have referred to does not go merely to the reading of the Scriptures, but to the Use of a Catechism also, for the Synod required, not merely that they should have the Right of hearing the Scriptures read, but of teaching the approved Catechism of the Church of Scotland. This being done at the Period set apart for Religious Instruction, and there being no Compulsion used for the Purpose of bringing the Children there, we did not consider it inconsistent with our Rules. In fact it appears to me that the Minister of the Established Church, the Minister of the Presbyterian Church, and the Minister of the Roman Catholic Church may in our Schools give strict Religious Instruction, each to the Children of his Flock, according to the Principles of his Church. The Protestant Minister may require that there shall be a Time set apart in any School within his Benefice, for enabling him to give Religious Instruction to such Children of his Flock as may attend. In the course of that Religious Instruction he may have the Children read the New Testament or the Bible; he may interpret it to them, and examine them in it, and in the Church Catechism and Liturgy also. The other Ministers of Religion may do likewise. We are not authorized by the State to give any Directions with respect to this Religious Instruction, nor are we furnished by the State with the Means of providing any; but any Clergyman who wishes to base the Education of the Children of his Flock in our Schools upon strict Religious Instruction in the Creed or Faith of their Church may do so. I can only say, that I should be better pleased to have the Children of each Persuasion brought up with strict Religious Instruction than without any.

From your Knowledge of the Classical Schools in Ireland, where the Children of the Gentry and Aristocracy are educated, do you think that those Children receive a more sound Scriptural Instruction than the Children of the labouring Man may receive in the National Schools of Ireland under the System of Education?

I should say not. I do not think that Scriptural Instruction is given in general in Classical Schools; whereas our Extracts convey much, and are very generally used.

You have stated that this authorizing of Scripture to be read in School Hours, and authorizing any Religious Instruction to be given in School Hours, with the Proviso, is equally applicable to all; will you state how it is possible for this Regulation to be carried into effect without giving an exclusive Advantage to the Applicants for the School in respect of the Children of their Religious Persuasion?

The Applicants for the Schools are in general Persons of different Religious Communions; the great Majority of the Applications made to us are from Persons of different Religious Communions.

Can this, which is proposed by the Synod of Ulster, and which was granted to the Synod of Ulster, and which you say may be done anywhere else on Application, be done without giving an exclusive Advantage to one Class of Religion. In the Case of the Synod of Ulster the reading the Bible is the Instruction that is specially to be given in School Hours, with the Proviso of teaching the Catechism according to the Church of Scotland; would it be possible, in Schools that are arranged according to that Plan, for equal Advantage to be given to the Children of other Persuasions in those very Schools?

I think it would; for a Clergyman of the Established Church or a Roman Catholic Clergyman may require, at a certain Period of the Day, that he shall have an Opportunity, by himself or by such Person as he shall appoint, to give Instruction to the Children of his Communion.

Then

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Then this Concession to the Synod of Ulster, of having the first and last Hours of the Schools for their special Religious Instruction in all Cases, would appear to you to imply no Unfairness whatever in respect to the Children of other Persuasions?

I do not consider that it was a Concession to the Synod of Ulster; I consider that what we did was in strict Adherence to the Principles of our Rules. I do not think that the Proposal of the Synod of Ulster was to have the first and the last Hours; they were to have a convenient Time set apart for Religious Instruction; and if in a School established by any Minister of the Synod of Ulster the Rector of the Parish desired that he might have an Opportunity to give Religious Instruction or cause it to be given to the Children of the Established Church, we should require that the Patron of the School afforded him an Opportunity of doing so; and if he did not, we would not allow him to remain in connexion with us.

Then, as the Committee understand you, the Board would not assent to Arrangements of one Religious Persuasion having, as the primary Rule of the particular School, the Assignation to them of any special Hours for their special Religious Instruction?

We require that the Patrons shall give a certain Time for Literary Instruction; it remains with them then to appoint any other Time that they think proper for Religious Instruction; and we require that all Persons who wish to have Religious Instruction given to the Children should have full Opportunity so to do, and that every Facility shall be afforded to them for that Purpose. I have already read to your Lordships our Rule upon the Subject. I should consider that if any Clergyman of the Established Church or of the Roman Catholic Church desired that there should be a convenient Time set apart for him he may take the very Portion of Time for his Flock that the Presbyterian Minister chose for his.

Is it practicable for the Instruction by Persons of different Persuasions to go on at the same Time?

I have seen Instruction on different Matters,—I do not mean in Religious Matters,—going on at the same Time.

You do not consider the making a Concession to one Party interferes with making it to another?

No.

Do you recollect one Instance in which the Children of one Persuasion were called into one of the Rooms, and those of another into another of the Rooms?

I have seen that done, and it may be done with great Ease; or you may take a Portion of the Children to one Side and another Portion to the other.

Have the Majority of the Schools more than one Schoolroom?

I do not think they have; but if the Difficulty were felt of giving Religious Instruction in one Room I should most heartily concur in giving another.

Have you not known different Religious Instructions given in different Rooms?

I have; and I have seen Literary Instruction on different Matters given in the same Room, so that I have no Doubt different Religious Instruction could be so given also.

You have no Doubt that in many Schools the Instruction of the Protestant Minister and of other Denominations is given in the Schools?

Undoubtedly it is.

In the Second of the Resolutions of the Synod of Ulster, which are admitted to be agreeable to the Regulations of the Board, it is stated, "That it shall be the Right of all Parents to require the Patrons and Managers of Schools to set apart for reading the Holy Scriptures a convenient and sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours, and to direct the Master or some other whom the Parents may appoint and provide to superintend the Reading." You have also stated, that it would be equally conformable to the Regulations of the Board, if any other Sort of Religious Instruction were given during a convenient and sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours; that is, that as regards

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

regards the same School in respect to which by the Synod of Ulster there had been a Demand of this Kind, that the Roman Catholics might have demanded that a convenient and sufficient Portion of the same stated School Hours, not the same Portion, might be assigned to them and the Church of England in the same Way?

Yes.

So that when the Board told the Synod of Ulster, that they saw nothing inconsistent with the Principles of the System of Education committed to their Charge in the Propositions which that Board had made, they included also the Power of telling Roman Catholics and Members of the Church of England that in the same Schools in which the Time was to be given to the Holy Scriptures of the stated School Hours, Time should be also given for the Instruction in the different Religions?

I so meant it, and I think the Board meant it, and was bound so to mean it, according to Lord Stanley's Letter.

Do you conceive that the Hours which are set apart for united Education must be continuous?

I think it more convenient that they should be.

There is no actual Rule of that Kind?

No Rule beyond what I have stated.

Is the Practice to that Effect?

I think it is.

Has the Synod of Ulster determined to come in under your System?

No; but Presbyterian Ministers have come in to a considerable Extent. I stated just now, that the Synod of Ulster required that the Catechism of the Church of Scotland should be used. Now I have just looked into their Propositions, and I cannot see any thing about it in them; but I am quite sure that in some Communication with us they insisted upon it.

You answered them, that you did not see any thing inconsistent in their Demand with the Principles upon which you acted; after that was there any Misunderstanding between you?

There was a long Correspondence between the Board and the Synod; and it appeared to us that the Synod was claiming more than we could yield to any Body of Persons; they seemed to require that we should enter into some specific Compact with them. We had made no particular Arrangement with the Established Church or with the Roman Catholics, and we could make no particular Arrangement with them. We said, I think, in effect to them, "Your Principles appear to us to be accordant with ours; but we must see, with respect to each Application for Aid from us, whether the particular School is to be conducted in such a Way as we can approve of. With that view we shall send Queries to each Applicant from your Body, as we do to all others, and we shall judge from your Answers what you mean to do. Your saying there shall be a convenient Time set apart for reading the Scriptures might mean with one Man quite different from what it would mean with another." Supposing we saw that an Applicant was setting apart a greater Portion of Time than we might think proper for the Purpose, having regard to what was necessary for common Instruction, we should make an Objection. We considered, in short, that their Principles might be acted upon according to our Rules; but we reserved to ourselves the Right, in every Case, to see whether the Parties intended so to act upon them or not.

In some of the Communications with the Synod of Ulster, and with others that took place about the same Time, did not it appear that the Commissioners had been using the Phrase "School Hours" or "Ordinary School Hours" very often to signify the Time set apart for Moral and Literary Education, in contradistinction to those allotted for Religious Instruction; whereas the Words "School Hours" was afterwards used as you have used it in the present Examination, to include the Time allotted for both of those Objects?

My general Impression is, that there was a Misconception as to what was meant by School Hours. We were supposed to mean that nothing could be done during School Hours except giving Moral and Literary Instruction.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

What are the Feelings and Opinions, as far as you are acquainted with them, of the Roman Catholics, with respect to the Perusal of the Holy Scriptures in the Schools?

The Roman Catholics object to the Use of the Scriptures without Note or Comment at any Time; they object to any such Use of them as might carry with it the Notion that the reading of the Scriptures afforded sufficient Religious Instruction. I have often spoken to the Roman Catholic Clergy upon the Subject, and it appeared to me that there was no Difference in Principle between what they stated in objection to the Use of the Scriptures in Schools and what I recollect was urged many Years ago by the then Professor March, now Bishop of Peterborough, against the Lancasterian System in England; he objected, and I understood at the Time that the Hierarchy in England generally objected also, to the Class of Schools in which the reading of the Scriptures was enjoined, and the Use of any Catechism prohibited, because it went to imply that the Use of the Scriptures was essential, but that the Use of the Catechism was not, and thus to create or encourage Indifference as to Creeds or Articles of Faith.

Are the Principles laid down in Lord Stanley's Letter strictly acted upon by the Board?

I consider them to have been strictly acted upon, unless where we have varied them by our Rules, or modified them, so as to remove Difficulties which appeared to us to arise from Misapprehension.

Have the Commissioners acted together with perfect Cordiality?

Perfect Cordiality.

What Course is taken when Complaints of any Kind are made to the Board?

When Complaints are made to the Board, we generally write to the Patron of the particular School, stating that a Complaint has been made so and so, and desiring an Explanation from him. If any Question arise upon the Explanation, or if any further Inquiry appear to us to be necessary, we then send an Inspector to the Spot for the Purpose of investigating and reporting to us upon the Facts of the Case.

What Inquiries are made before Applications which are made are acceded to?

The Applications, as they come up, are examined by a Committee, which consists of Mr. Carlile, who is the Resident Commissioner, and One or Two Officers of the Board. They examine each Application minutely, and upon our Days of meeting they bring up the Applications to the Board, and report to us the general Nature of them. If there is any thing special or particular, they call our particular Attention to it, and then we decide. At first we acted upon each Application as it came in on communicating with the Correspondent, provided it appeared from his Description or Station that he was a Person with whom we might correspond. But a Rule was adopted by the Board about Two or Three Years ago, (indeed I think I proposed it myself,) that in future no Grants should be made until an Inspector had visited the Place from which the Application came, and had made a Report to us upon the Subject; and now we never make a Grant without that, unless there be something particular in the Case, or that we know particularly the Person applying to us.

Was the Rule that you have just mentioned proposed by you in consequence of any very great Inconvenience that was felt to result from the former Practice?

We found, upon an Inspection of some Schools which had been taken into connexion with us at an early Period, that they were not proper Schools to be kept upon our List; we then struck them off, and I think it was in consequence of that that we made this Rule.

Do you recollect any Case of a proper School having been put on the List of the Board without a Communication with the Patron or the Clergy and the respectable Householders of the Parish?

We communicate only with our Correspondent, and he is the Person whom we contemplate as the Patron.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

You have said that the Principles laid down in Lord Stanley's Letter have been strictly acted upon?
I think so, except as to Points on which they have been varied on Explanations with the Government.

You would say that the Principles of Lord Stanley's Letter, with the subsequent Alterations made by Authority, have been acted upon?
I think so.

Will you have the goodness to refer to Lord Stanley's Letter. You will perceive that it is stated that the Board "will invariably require, as a Condition not to be departed from, that local Funds shall be raised, upon which any Aid from the Public will be dependent. They will refuse all Applications in which the following Objects are not locally provided for." You will see these Four Points: "First, a Fund sufficient for the annual Repairs of the Schoolhouse and Furniture: Second, a permanent Salary for the Master, not less than Pounds: Third, a Sum sufficient to purchase Books and School Requisites at Half Price." Do you say that those Two first Points have been ultimately adhered to?
The Course pursued, I think, is this; a Question is put as to what the Funds are out of which those Purposes are to be effected, and the Answer to that is considered by the Committee; if they consider that the Answer is satisfactory, the Grant is made; if not, it is not. With respect to the permanent Salary for the Master, not less than Pounds, that, as your Lordships will perceive, was never settled.

Do not you consider that the Principle of a permanent Salary of some Sort was insisted on in that Letter?
The Principle of a permanent Salary certainly appears to be meant in that Letter. We had Communication, to the best of my Recollection, with the Government, or a Discussion upon the Subject amongst ourselves, as to whether the Contributions from Children who would attend the School, and would pay something, should be taken into consideration as forming a local Fund towards a permanent Income for the Master. The Decision was, that it should. Those Points of Detail, as to what Provision is made, or what Provision is not made, are all considered by the Committee, and they merely report to us generally upon the Application. We do not at the Board when we meet go minutely into the Particulars of each Application.

Will you be so good as to produce, on the next Day of the Committee's meeting, the Communication which took place between the Board and the Government on the Subject of Salaries to the Masters, to which you have alluded?
I do not know whether there was a written Communication or not, for when the Board was formed there was a great deal took place in vivâ voce Communication, and so forth. I am pretty sure that our Regulations, which have been from Time to Time laid before Parliament, have been adapted to our Practice.

Can you produce, at the next Time of the Committee's meeting, that Regulation? In the meantime the Committee would direct your Attention to these remarkable Words: "They will invariably require, as a Condition not to be departed from, that local Funds shall be raised, upon which any Aid from the Public will be dependent. They will refuse all Applications in which the following Objects are not locally provided for;" and then these Two Points are mentioned, "A Fund sufficient for the annual Repairs of the Schoolhouse and Furniture; a permanent Salary for the Master;" and your Attention having been called to those Points, will you give the Rule to which that refers?
The Sixth Query is this: "What are the Sources from which the annual Income of the School is derived, and what is the Amount of such Income?" The Answer comes up, and it is then considered by the Committee.

Have you attended those Committees?
Never, that I recollect.

You

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

You do not know whether the Committee does consider it necessary to require that the permanent Salary of the Master should be provided?

I am sure, from what I have stated to your Lordships, that they act in the Way I have already mentioned. I recollect a Discussion upon the Subject, and the Issue of that was, that it was considered that if there was a Provision made through Payments by or for the Children, that would be satisfactory. I have that Impression quite upon my Mind. Then with respect to the furnishing the Schools, and so forth, the Course that we take is this: An Estimate is sent up to us of the Sum that will be necessary for the particular Purpose; then we state that we will grant so and so towards it; we do not pay our Quota until we get an Account of the Expenditure. Now it has sometimes appeared, when we got the Account, that the Money laid out did not amount to as much as the Estimate. The Patrons have in these Cases applied for what we originally designed to grant; but this we refuse; we say, for instance, "We agreed to give you 20*l.* towards an Expenditure of 30*l.*; now we perceive that your Expenditure has been only 21*l.*, we will therefore give you only 14*l.*" I give that as an Illustration of the Principle upon which we act.

Where no Provision appears to be made, by the Payment of Children or otherwise, there the Board refuses to make a Grant of Salary?

I should consider that the Committee ought, according to our Rules, to see that in some Way or other there is a local Contribution; they may have in some particular Case Reason for not doing it, but I have no Recollection myself of any such.

There is another of the Principles of Lord Stanley's Letter, to which the Committee would direct your Attention; that which relates to the Appointment of Teachers. "They will allow to the Individuals or Bodies applying for Aid the Appointment of their own Teachers, subject to the following Restrictions and Regulations: 1st, He or she shall be liable to be fined, suspended, or removed altogether by the Authority of the Commissioners, who shall however record their Reasons." Upon which there is no Question. "2dly, He shall have received previous Instruction in a Model School to be established in Dublin. N.B. It is not intended that this Regulation should apply to prevent the Admission of Masters or Mistresses of Schools already established who may be approved of by the Commissioners." And in the Document which you have there is this Addition: "nor of such as the Board may think fit to appoint before the proposed Model School may come into full Operation." Now, coupled with that, and the Direction as to the Manner in which the Funds shall be applied, which they shall apply to the following Purposes,—establishing and maintaining a Model School in Dublin, and training Teachers for Country Schools,—do you think that the Principles in Lord Stanley's Letter require that training Teachers for Country Schools should have been attempted before this Time?

The training of the Teachers for Country Schools could not be attempted till we had the Means of training them, and those Means I cannot say that we have perfect at this Moment. I should beg leave to add that we have been very urgent with His Majesty's Government upon this Part of the Subject; we had to provide suitable Premises and to obtain adequate Funds; we have at length got both, but not without Difficulty.

"He shall have received Testimonials of good Conduct and of general Fitness for the Situation from the Board. They will allow to the Individuals or Bodies applying for Aid the Appointment of their own Teacher, subject to the following Restrictions and Regulations: 1st, He or she shall be liable to be fined, suspended, or removed altogether by the Authority of the Commissioners, who shall however record their Reasons. 2dly, He shall have received previous Instruction in a Model School to be established in Dublin. N.B. It is not intended that this Regulation should apply to prevent the Admission of Masters or Mistresses of Schools already established, who may be approved of by the Commissioners, nor of such as the Board may think fit to appoint before the proposed Model School may come into full Operation." Has One of those Restrictions and Regulations been in short attended to?

I consider that we are not as yet in a Situation to give those Testimonials.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

My Notion is, that before we give Testimonials we should have the Teachers with us for more than a Year.

Then you are not in a Situation to comply with that?

We have repeatedly, in our Reports, mentioned our Difficulties and Anxiety as to Means for training and bringing forward proper Teachers.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Jovis, 9° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Right Honourable ANTHONY RICHARD BLAKE is called in, and further examined as follows:

You have stated the Opinion which you formed of the Character of the Schoolmasters in the Year 1824; from your present Experience and Observation, what should you say is their Character at present?

I have not had Opportunities of late of examining many Country Schools; I have seen only a few; these were connected with the Board, and the Teachers were of a good Description.

What Opinion have you formed generally as to the Progress of the System, and its Prospect of ultimate Success?

The System has been already adopted extensively. We had at the Time of our last Report about 1,200 Schools, attended by about 150,000 Children. It has been said that the Protestants of Ireland repudiated us, but the Fact is otherwise; we had in the most Protestant Province of Ireland, in Ulster, 450 Schools. The Number of Protestants and of Roman Catholics in 373 of these has been ascertained, and there are I understand in them about 14,000 or 15,000 Protestants and about 22,000 Roman Catholics. Assuming that in each County the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Schools that have not been reported upon the same as in the Schools that have been, I understand it may be considered that we have altogether about 17,000 Protestants and 28,000 Roman Catholics. I have not myself examined the Reports which show how many Protestants there are and how many Roman Catholics; they were not made pursuant to any Order of the Board; they were procured by Mr. Carlile, and I speak from Information communicated to me by him. In Leinster, Munster, and Connaught Protestants are principally to be found amongst the higher and middle Classes; there are in general very few Protestants of the Class for which our Schools are intended, except in Dublin and other Cities or Towns, where there are Protestant Schools supported by Endowments, Contributions from the Clergy, Collections after Sermons, and so forth. The Mass of the Poor, particularly in the rural Districts, is composed of Roman Catholics; therefore in these Provinces our Schools are principally composed of them. In Ulster, the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools approximates what it is in the Mass of the Population, but in the other Provinces it does not, and the Reason is, that in Ulster there is an extensive poor Protestant Population, whereas in the other Provinces that is not the Case.

The Peasantry and Tenantry are more generally Protestant than in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught?

Yes; and I am under an Impression generally that the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools in Ulster is as high as the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Ecclesiastical Province of Armagh appears to be, according to the Returns of the Commissioners of Public Instruction.

Do you happen to know how high it is in Dublin; have you ever examined any of the Schools yourself in Dublin?

I cannot say that I have.

You have not informed yourself, by personal Observation or by Inquiry, of the State of the Schools in the City of Dublin in that respect?

No; I have occasionally gone into Schools, but I should be afraid to ask the

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Number of Protestants or Roman Catholics, lest I should excite Jealousy or Apprehension.

Can you point out any Circumstances which have occurred to you which might account for a smaller Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Schools in Dublin, with reference to the total Population, than in the Country Districts?

I understand that there are Parochial Protestant Schools in Dublin under the Direction of the Clergy, in which the Protestant Children, I suppose, are educated.

Are those under the National Board?

No.

Do not those Parochial Schools prevail generally throughout Ireland?

There are Schools which are called Parochial Protestant Schools, but I do not know that one can properly consider them such in general. There are Schools towards the Support of which the Incumbent contributes; that is to say, he gives 40*s.* a Year to some Person to conduct a School, or to a Person, perhaps, who is already conducting one; and the Schools to which that Contribution is given are generally considered Parochial Schools; we treated them as such in the Report which we made in 1825.

They are totally distinct from the Hedge Schools of which you spoke the other Day?

I apprehend some are not; I would not speak positively on the Subject, but in some Cases I am inclined to think that Masters of pay Schools receive some Contribution from Clergymen of the Protestant Church in the Way I have mentioned.

Those Parochial Schools are not universally Protestant in respect to the Children who are taught in them?

No, certainly not.

Is not the Clergyman required by Law to maintain a School, or to contribute 40*s.* towards a School?

He is required by Law to teach himself a School, or cause one to be taught.

Is not the Contribution of 40*s.* the Mode in which practically that teaching is endeavoured to be given?

I believe that the Contribution of 40*s.* is intended as a Sort of Performance of the Duty cast upon the Clergyman. I do not myself conceive that a Clergyman is, under the Act of Henry the Eighth, which is the Law I have been referring to, bound to keep a free School; I do not think it was the Meaning of the Act that he should do so. The Act says, "taking for the same the customary Stipend payable within this Land."

In your Report in 1824 did you not repeat the Opinion that you are now giving?

I think we did; but I should beg leave to refer to the Report for the Fact.

Your Answer to one of the Questions was, that the Clergy in Ireland contributed 40*s.* in many Cases to the Support of Schools; you do not mean to say by that Answer that that is the only Contribution or Countenance or Support that the Clergy of the Established Church give to Schools of that Description?

Certainly not.

They do give their Countenance and Support and personal Attention to Schools?

I apprehend that they do in some Cases.

Beyond the 40*s.* which they are bound by Law to give?

In my Opinion they are not bound by Law to give it.

Does it not appear upon the Face of the Act of Henry the Eighth that it was

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

was intended at that Period for the Education of Roman Catholics as well as Protestants?

I think the Act provides for the bidding of the Beads in the English Tongue.

You have stated that the System works well, especially in Ulster, and enjoys the Favour of all Parties?

That I think it works well in Ulster, for the Reasons I have stated.

Do you happen to recollect to have ever heard of a Case that is said to have occurred at Ballinally in the County of Antrim?

I have no Recollection of any Case that occurred there.

Do you recollect any Case where the Excitement against those Schools was so strong in Ulster that Twelve Schools at once threw up their Connexion with the Board?

I do not recollect any such Occurrence; but I know that there has been a strong Manifestation of Feeling against the Board occasionally in Ulster, and that it has sometimes shown itself in Acts of Outrage.

Do you conceive that generally in those Parts of the Province of Ulster in which you understand the System to have worked well the Clergy of the Established Church support the System?

Speaking from general Recollection, my Impression is, that in Ulster the Clergymen of the Established Church who support the System bear to the Roman Catholic Clergymen who do so nearly as high a Proportion as Protestants of the Established Church do to Roman Catholics in the whole Population. You will find a greater Number of Clergymen of the Established Church Correspondents of the Board in Ulster than in any other Province of Ireland.

But the Clergymen of the Established Church are as numerous as the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church in the Country?

They are, I believe, in Ulster.

Then there is no Necessity for a Reference to the Proportion of the Population in giving the Proportion of the Clergymen of the Established Church to the Roman Catholic Clergy supporting this System?

The Way in which it bears upon the Subject is this; the Two Proportions, when considered, show that the Degree in which the respective Clergy embrace the System is in some measure proportioned to the Circumstances of their Flocks. The Protestant Clergyman does not probably take much Trouble upon himself about the Education of Roman Catholics, but he does about that of Protestants.

Do you think that the System can be said to work well in any Parish where the Clergymen do not themselves attend the Schools in which there are some of their own Flock?

I should not say that it was worked well in that District by those whose Province it is to give Religious Instruction; I should be myself very glad that the Clergy of both Persuasions would give Religious Instruction in every School in which there are Children of their respective Flocks.

Part of the System is, that a Day shall be set apart for Religious Instruction; that Part of the System cannot be considered to work favourably if the Clergy do not attend to carry it into execution?

With the separate Religious Instruction the Commissioners have nothing to do; they have no Power of enforcing separate Religious Instruction at all. If it be not given the Fault is not with the System, but with those who neglect their Duty.

But the Commissioners would not consider the general System to work well where that was neglected?

I should not think that it was worked well where that was neglected. In Schools where there are both Roman Catholic and Protestant Children the Clergy of both ought to take care that the Children have Religious Instruction.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

But you do not consider the System working well where there are Protestants and Roman Catholics in the Schools, and where a certain Proportion, namely, the Protestants, do not receive Religious Instruction?

Where such is the Fact the System is not worked as well as I should wish, but it works more equitably upon the whole than any previous System supported by public Grants ever did. The Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools is nearer the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Mass of the Population than was the Case in any of the pre-existing Schools that were supported by public Grants.

You profess to have been acquainted with the working of the Kildare Place System?

Yes.

Do you think that the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the existing Schools of your Institution is equal to the Proportion that existed in the Kildare Place Schools?

The Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools is much nearer the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Mass of the Population than was the Case in the Kildare Place Schools. I think it appears that in the Kildare Place Schools there were nearly an equal Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics, whereas the Roman Catholics constitute to the Protestants more than Four to One in the Mass of the Population, and probably more than Five or Six to One in that Part of the Population which requires Aid from the State for the Purpose of Education. Now, I think it will be found by the Reports on our Schools, to which I have already referred, that in the Schools to which they particularly relate the Proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants is not Six to One.

More than Five to One?

More than Five but not Six to One.

In Cases where the Protestant Clergyman for any Reason does not attend the National School to instruct the Children is it usual for any other Person to be so employed?

We do not interfere at all, nor am I aware that any other Person is employed. I know that in our Model School in Dublin a Protestant Clergyman of the Established Church does attend and give Instruction once a Week.

According to your Rules, would there be any Objection, in the event of the Protestant Clergyman of the Parish not being able, from Want of Leisure or otherwise, to attend to the School himself to give Instruction, to his appointing another Clergyman to give that Instruction, supposing such a Clergyman could be found?

There could not be the least Objection to that, or to his appointing any other Person.

Have the Protestants attending the Schools increased or diminished in positive Numbers as compared with those attending the Schools under the Kildare System?

Until very lately I had no Notion whatever of the Numbers in our Schools, nor am I now able to compare the Numbers at one Time with the Numbers at another, as I do not know what they formerly were. My present Information is derived entirely from Mr. Carlile; he has examined the Reports, and stated to me the Results.

You cannot speak from your own Knowledge, and you would recommend the Committee to apply to Mr. Carlile for that Information?

I do not think Mr. Carlile could give the Information; the Commissioners had no official Information until lately as to the Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics in their Schools. Mr. Carlile, some Time, I think, in the course of the last Year, desired the Inspectors to ascertain the Numbers as well as they could, without making any Display that might create Jealousy, and to give him any Information upon the Subject they might be able to obtain; he has procured Statements in this Way with respect to several Schools. I have now a Document which shows the Result in detail; I find by it that there are 14,627 Protestants and 22,337 Roman Catholics in the Schools of Ulster already reported upon; and if the Protestants are to the Roman

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Roman Catholics in the other Schools of the several Counties of the same Province what they are in the Schools of each County already reported upon, there are altogether about 17,000 Protestants and 28,000 Roman Catholics. Having said that, perhaps your Lordships will allow me to refer you to the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, which gives the Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics generally in Ireland; the Numbers in the Province of Armagh, which I apprehend includes the whole or nearly the whole of Ulster, are 517,722 Members of the Established Church, 638,073 Presbyterians, 15,823 other Protestant Dissenters, and 1,955,123 Roman Catholics.

When is that dated?
1835.

You have stated that the Proportion of Catholics to Protestants in the present Schools is more commensurate with the State of the Population than the Proportion which they bore to the Protestants in the Schools of the Kildare Place Establishment?
Yes.

Does that arise from there being fewer Protestants or more Catholics?
It arises from there being more Catholics; the Catholics, having regard to their Amount in the Mass of the Population, formed a small Portion of the Children educated in the Kildare Place Schools; they were absolutely more in Number, but proportionally much less than in the Mass of the Population. The Roman Catholics are more than Four to One in the whole Population, and probably Six to One, or more, among the poorer Classes; yet in the Kildare Place Schools they were little more than One to One; they therefore bore a much smaller Proportion to the Protestants in those Schools than they ought. If then they are in our Schools Six to One, I should say that the Proportion approaches what it ought to be in a degree that in the others it did not at all.

But you are aware that that Proportion may be effected in Two Ways, by the Increase of the Number of the Catholics, or by the Decrease of the Number of Protestants; are there fewer Protestants in those Schools than used to attend the Kildare Street Schools?
According to my Recollection of Documents that I have lately looked at, the Number of Protestants attending our Schools is greater absolutely than the Number of Protestants that attended those that were solely in connexion with the Kildare Place Society. I think it appears by a Report of the Commissioners of 1825 that the Number of Protestants at that Time attending Schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Place Society was about 16,600, whereas I am led to believe that the Number attending our Schools exceeds 18,000.

Then do you conceive that the Report of the Kildare Street Society in 1831 was erroneous?
I do not know that. I am speaking of the State of the Schools at the Time we reported upon them in 1826; I am speaking with reference to the only Returns that I have ever heard professed to give the Numbers of Protestants and Roman Catholics in the Kildare Place Schools; the Kildare Place Society could not state what they were in 1824. The Commissioners however made strict Inquiries upon the Subject from the Clergy of the different Parishes, and thus obtained the Information from which I have been speaking. The Details are given in their Second Report; and if your Lordships will allow me to refer to it I can give the Numbers exactly. It appears by it that there were then in the Schools connected solely with the Kildare Place Society in Ulster 4,670 Children of the Established Church, 7,454 Presbyterians, 281 other Protestant Dissenters, and 5,017 Roman Catholics; in Leinster, 2,577 of the Established Church, Sixty Presbyterians, and One other Protestant Dissenter, and 7,180 Roman Catholics; in Munster, 1,106 of the Established Church, One Presbyterian, Three Protestant Dissenters, and 3,269 Roman Catholics; and in Connaught, 424 of the Established Church, Six Presbyterians, and 3,173 Roman Catholics. I believe that I have already explained that I have been speaking of those Schools that were solely connected with the Kildare Place Society.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Then in fact, according to that Statement, the Proportion of Roman Catholics in the last Province, namely Connaught, to the Protestants educated in the Kildare Place Schools, was much greater than the Proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants under your System?

It appears by the Document to which I have already referred that the Number of Roman Catholics attending the Schools of the Board in Connaught is 14,186; under the Kildare Street Society it was 3,173. The Number of Protestants in Connaught attending the Schools in exclusive Connexion with the Kildare Society was 424; the Number attending ours, as far as we have ascertained it, is 277.

Then the Effect in that particular Province has been to diminish the Number of Protestants who attended the Schools; that the Number of Protestants in your Schools is less than the Number attending the Kildare Street Schools?

In that Province the Number is less; in Ulster it is more.

Will you state what it is in each of the Provinces?

I will. The Number of Protestants attending the Schools of our Board, so far as Information has been obtained, is in Ulster 14,627; in those exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society it was 12,124.

In what Year was that?

In 1826. I have been speaking entirely with reference to the Report of the Commissioners in 1826.

That was an Increase of 2,000?

The total Number of Protestants in those of our Schools in Ulster that have been actually reported upon exceeds the total Number of Protestants that were in the Schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society by considerably more than 2,000.

Does that Return take in all the Schools in Ulster, or only those that have been visited?

This Account takes in only the Schools that have been already visited. Assuming that the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the Schools not reported upon in each County is equal to the Proportion in the Schools that have been visited, there are in Ulster about 17,000 Protestants and 28,000 Roman Catholics.

Will you proceed with the other Provinces?

In Leinster the Numbers in our Schools, so far as they have been ascertained, are 702 Protestants and 35,318 Roman Catholics. The Numbers under the Kildare Place Society were 2,577 of the Established Church, Sixty Presbyterians, One Protestant Dissenter, and 7,180 Roman Catholics.

Then the Number of Protestants is very much decreased in Leinster?

The Number of Protestants is less in our Schools in Leinster than it was in the Kildare Place Schools in 1826. In Munster the Numbers in our Schools, so far as they have been ascertained, are 154 Protestants, and 19,108 Roman Catholics. In 1825 the Numbers in the Kildare Place Schools were 1,106 of the Established Church, One Presbyterian, Three other Protestant Dissenters, and 3,269 Roman Catholics.

Then there has been a Diminution in that Province?

There is a less Number of Protestants in our Schools in that Province than there was in the Kildare Place Schools.

Then comparing the Kildare Place Schools in 1826 with your Schools the Number of Protestants to Catholics has been decreased, not only by an increased Number of Catholics, but also by a diminished Number of Protestants?

The contrary. Take the whole of Ireland together, and the Number of Protestants is increased; the Number of Roman Catholics is vastly, but not I think in a degree greater than is proportioned to their Number in the poorer Classes of the Population.

What

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

What was the total Number of Children in 1826 educated in the Kildare Place Schools?

37,146 in the Schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society in 1826.

Then you state that the Number of Protestants now educated in your Schools exceeds the Number of Protestants that were educated in those Schools at that Period?

I do.

Will you have the goodness to add the Total up and state it?

I will. I ought to state that the Information we have received extends only to a certain Number of our Schools. In these the total Number of Protestants educated is 15,760; the total Number of Roman Catholics is 90,949. From Calculations which we have made we conclude that there must be 3,000 or 4,000 Protestants besides in the remaining Schools, and of course a great many more Roman Catholics.

The Committee understand the Nature of your Evidence is to prove, in corroboration of your Statement, that this System is working better than any previous System which has been instituted; that you have now a greater Number of Protestants in Education as well as Roman Catholics than they had in 1826 under the Kildare Place System?

Yes, than the Kildare Place Society had in the Schools exclusively connected with them.

Under the Kildare Place System you state that the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics was nearly One Half?

Yes.

Then if in the Year 1831, when the Grants were withdrawn from the Kildare Place Society, the Number of Children had been calculated, and the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics had remained the same as it was in 1826, would there not be educated under that System a much greater Number of Protestants than there would be under the present System?

There would. I should here however observe, that there was a Difference between the Report of the Society in 1825 and the Report made by the Commissioners at that Time. According to the Report of the Society there were under it, I think, about 1,500 Schools, whereas the Number reported by the Commissioners was only 900 or thereabouts; this led to Communications between the Commissioners and the Society, and the Result is given in the Second Report of the Commissioners, the Report made in 1826. The Commissioners say in it, "The Society subsequently transmitted to us a List dated June 1825, of every School in connexion with them on the 5th of April preceding. We have inserted this List in the Appendix to this Report. There are 1,517 Schools contained in it; 900 of these Schools are included in the Returns made to us by the Clergy, and 617 are not included in them; we have set forth in the Appendix a List specifying the 900 which are included, and also a List specifying the 617 not included. It will be observed that the Difference between the Returns of the Clergy and the List of the Society consists principally in this, that the Returns of the Clergy include only such Schools as they found open and in operation in the Autumn of 1824, whereas the List of the Society includes Schools to which they had granted or agreed to grant Aid, and which were therefore upon their Books, although not going forward. At the Time when the Returns of the Clergy were made to us some Schools were temporarily closed, some had been closed for a considerable Time, but it was hoped would be revived, some had not then commenced, and some were entered upon the Books of the Society after the Returns of the Clergy had been sent in."

Will you recall your Attention to the Number of Protestants that were actually attending your Schools; you state it to be 14,627 in Ulster?

Yes; in the Schools in respect of which Information has been obtained, there being many Schools in respect of which Information has not been obtained.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

In 1826 how many Protestants attended the Schools exclusively under the Kildare Street Establishment?

I think the Total amounted to about 16,600.

Was there any great Increase from the Year 1825 to 1830 and 1831 in the Kildare Street Schools?

I have no Information whatever upon which I could speak with any Confidence upon the Subject.

In your Belief was there not?

I have no more Ground to form any Belief that I should consider deserving of Attention, as to whether there was or not, than any one of your Lordships; I could express nothing more than mere Surmise, and I should therefore be sorry to give any Opinion upon the Subject.

Then you are incompetent to give any Opinion, except an Opinion founded on the State of the Kildare Street Schools in 1826?

I do not think myself incompetent to give any Opinion; but I do not feel that I have Data whereon to form that deliberate Opinion which alone I should wish to express when speaking upon Oath.

But, speaking upon Oath, you do not wish to give any Opinion, except that founded upon the Comparison of your Schools at the present Time with the Schools of the Kildare Street Establishment in the Year 1826?

My Inquiries as a Commissioner of Education ceased in 1827; from that Time to the Time of my Appointment to the present Board I made no particular Inquiries which would enable me to speak with any thing like Certainty as to the intermediate State of Education in Ireland. I have hitherto spoken entirely from authentic Documents. If your Lordships desire me to state what I have heard here and there upon the Subject I am ready to do so.

Is the Comparison you have drawn between the working of the Two Systems drawn from the authentic Documents of 1825 and the Returns you have derived from Mr. Carlile, or is it derived from any other Source of Information?

I have endeavoured throughout to state to your Lordships the Grounds upon which I have formed my Opinions; that I have formed them upon my own Experience as a Commissioner in 1825 and 1826, and upon the Information which I have now received from Mr. Carlile. I have stated this throughout to your Lordships; it is upon these Grounds only that I rest.

You have adverted in your Answer to Schools that were exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society, and to other Schools that were partially connected with it and partially with other Institutions; are there many of those Schools so partially connected that still exist, or are most of them now in connexion with the National System?

I am not able to speak to that Point, for I have not made any Inquiries with respect to the working of the Kildare Place System since the Period I have already mentioned.

Do you know whether the Association for discountenancing Vice is still in operation?

I apprehend that it is. The Comparison which I have been drawing has been between the working of our System in Schools solely connected with us and the working of the Kildare Place Society's System in Schools solely connected with them. I have no Doubt that there were many more Protestants educated under the Kildare Place Society and other Institutions put together than there are now under us alone; but I do not believe that there were under any of them separately so many as there are under us.

Taking into your Consideration all the different Means by which the Kildare Street Society acted, can you give the Committee, from any authentic Information in your Possession, an Account of the Number of Protestants that were by these Means provided with Education?

I think the Number of Children that were educated in Schools connected with the Kildare Place Society, and also with the Association for discountenancing Vice, or the Hibernian Society, or other Societies in Ireland, was about

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

about 58,000, and that the total Number of Protestants was about 26,000 or 27,000, in 1825.

You have stated that in the Province of Connaught there are 14,186 Roman Catholics and 277 Protestants, which is as Fifty-five to One; that in the Board Schools in Munster the Number of Protestants is stated to be 154, and of Roman Catholics 19,108, the Proportion there being 124 Roman Catholics to One Protestant; in Leinster the Number of Protestant Children were 702 and 35,318 Roman Catholics, which will leave a Proportion of somewhat more than Fifty to One of Roman Catholics to Protestants. In those Three Provinces therefore the Proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants in the Schools of the Board is very much greater than the Proportion of the Roman Catholics to the Protestants in the general Population of the Country?

Undoubtedly.

Then whether the Board, so far as that important Object is concerned, the collecting Children of different Communions in the Schools, has succeeded or not in Ulster, where it has succeeded the most, in the other Three Provinces, it has failed?

In the other Three Provinces it has not succeeded to the Degree that it has succeeded in Ulster.

You stated before that the Object had failed in the Three Provinces, and now you say that it has not succeeded to the Degree that it has succeeded in Ulster; does not the Proportion in Leinster of Fifty to One, in Munster of 124 to One, and in Connaught of Fifty-five to One, show an immense Disproportion of Protestant Children in the Schools of the Board?

I never said it had failed. There is an immense Disproportion if the Numbers be considered in the Abstract, undoubtedly.

In those Three Provinces, therefore, in one of the main Objects, namely, to unite in One System Children of different Creeds, as declared in Lord Stanley's Letter, do not you consider that it has signally failed?

I do not think that it has signally failed, but the contrary, as compared with any other System.

Will you answer first whether you consider it per se to have signally failed?

In order to answer that Question, I should know to what Extent the Aid of the System was required by Protestant Poor in those several Provinces, for it is with reference to the Wants of the Population that I should speak. In Ulster I know, and I believe I have stated that already to your Lordships, that there is a very extensive poor Protestant Population; and in Ulster the Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools is considerable. In the other Provinces there is not an extensive poor Protestant Population, and therefore I could not expect that there would be the same Proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our Schools in these Provinces that there is in the former.

Putting the Case of the Province of Munster, where the Roman Catholics are as 124 to One, do you think that that can be an Approximation to the real Proportion of the poor Population of Protestants to the poor Population of Roman Catholics?

However extraordinary it may appear to your Lordships, I should feel a Difficulty in answering the Question, for this Reason, that there may have been existing in Munster before the Introduction of our System, and my Belief is that there were, a great many Schools for the Education of Protestants; then if there were, and that the Number of Protestant poor Children not thus provided with the Means of Education was very trifling, our System may have completely succeeded in providing for the Number that was not provided for before. I should say, for the Part of Ireland that I know most of, Connaught, that I do not believe there are any Number of Protestant Children that are not in a Course of Education either in the Schools that were pre-existing or in ours. Connected with what I have been now saying, there is a Fact to which I beg leave to call your Lordships Attention. You will find, by Reference to the First Report that was made by the Commissioners of Inquiry in 1825, that out of 431 Grants that had been made towards the Establishment of Schools in Ireland by the Commissioners who

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

at that Time acted for the Lord Lieutenant, above 400 were made to Protestants, and only about Twelve to Roman Catholics; thus there had been a great and extensive Provision previously made for the Education of Protestants, and they did not stand in that Need of Aid from us which Roman Catholics did.

A Question has been asked of you as to the signal Failure of the System, and Reference has been made to the Object; was not the System proposed in order to give Assistance to the Education of Protestants in those Cases where they stood in need of it?

The Intention of course was to provide for them only according to their Wants; we never desired to destroy any pre-existing Institution that was affording sound Education to any Class of the People.

Will you read the Statement of the Number in Munster of the Roman Catholics and Protestants?

The total Number of Members of the Established Church in the Ecclesiastical Province of Cashel is stated in the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction to be 111,813, the Number of Roman Catholics to be 2,220,340, the Number of Presbyterians to be 966, and the Number of other Protestant Dissenters to be 2,454. I must add, from my own former Experience in Munster, that there are in my Judgment very few Protestants amongst the lower Classes of the People there; the Protestants form a much larger Proportion of the higher and middling Classes than they do of the Mass of the Population, and therefore they constitute a much smaller Proportion of the poorer Class.

Then this is the Result, that there are 2,220,340 Roman Catholics and 115,233 Protestants; the Proportion there is somewhat less than Twenty to One?

Yes, in the whole Population.

Then, the Proportion of the Roman Catholic Population in Munster to the Protestant Population being as Twenty to One, and it appearing that the Number of Roman Catholic Scholars in the Schools of the Board in Munster are 124 to One, do you still consider that the Board System has not failed in that Province?

I cannot say that I consider the Board System to have failed in that Province, as applied to Persons in want of Education.

In the Province of Ulster, where the Proportion of Protestants attending the Schools to Roman Catholics is so much larger than elsewhere, do you recollect whether many of the Applications have been solely from the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Religion?

I do not think that there have been many.

You do not recollect distinctly how hat is?

My Impression is, that very few Applications have come exclusively from them.

That is your Impression, that the Application has been from the Clergy of both Religions?

Not from the Clergy of both Persuasions. In Ulster we have a vast Number of Schools under the Direction of Laymen; when I say under the Direction of Laymen, I speak of the Persons with whom we correspond; we look to our Correspondents in general as the Persons who have the Management of our Schools; and in Ulster a considerable Number of our Correspondents are composed of Laymen, Protestant and Roman Catholic.

Are those Applications made by Gentlemen of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Priesthood, combined with the Laity?

They are in some Instances made by Protestant Clergymen and Roman Catholic Clergymen, or Roman Catholic Laymen; in others by Roman Catholic Clergymen and Protestant Laymen, or by Protestant Laymen and Roman Catholic Laymen.

But in almost all Cases the Roman Catholic Clergyman is One of the Applicants?

I should not say that with respect to Ulster. I observe, by referring to our last

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

last Report, that the Number of Roman Catholic Clergymen in Ulster who are Correspondents of the Board is 101, the Number of Clergymen of the Established Church is Twenty-three, the Number of Presbyterian Clergymen is Forty, the Number of Protestant Laymen is 110, and the Number of Roman Catholic Laymen Twenty-two.

What is the Number of the Schools in that Province?

Four hundred and fifty-two. In some Cases a Person has Three or Four Schools under him. The total Number of Correspondents in Ulster is 296; of that Number 101 are Roman Catholic Clergymen, and Twenty-two Roman Catholic Laymen; so that of the 296 your Lordships will observe that 173 are Protestants.

Then it appears from that Statement that the Religious Education of those Schools in Ulster is better attended to on the Part of the Roman Catholic Clergy than it is on the Part of the Clergy, Presbyterian and Protestant?

There is a greater Number of the Roman Catholic Clergy than of the Protestant; the Roman Catholic Clergymen who are Correspondents amount to 101, and the Clergy of the Established Church and the Presbyterian amount to Sixty-three; and if we look to the Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics in the Population of Ulster, we shall find the Proportion is pretty nearly the same as that of Protestant Clergymen to Roman Catholic Clergymen amongst our Correspondents.

Do you know by what Means the Religious Education of those Children in the Province of Ulster, comprising the Protestant Children, is attended to in those Cases where the Protestant Clergy have not been Applicants for the Schools?

I cannot tell.

Then you do not know whether or not the Religious Education of those Protestants may not be totally neglected?

I cannot say whether the Clergy do their Duty or not; the Duty of giving Religious Instruction is the Duty of the Clergy.

Have the Board taken any Care to provide Religious Instruction in Cases where the Clergy have not applied for Schools?

The Board are not allowed to interfere with what is considered to be the peculiar Province and Duty of the Clergy; it was considered by His Majesty's Government, when it gave the System in charge to us, that it was the bounden Duty of the Clergy of the Country to attend to the Religious Instruction of the Children of their respective Flocks. We do not presume that they abandon their Duty to the Public; on the contrary, we presume that they attend to it.

You presume that they abandon it in those Schools which they do not profess to support?

I do not presume that.

Do you know any Instances in which the Clergy have not been Applicants for Schools, and where they attend the Schools for the Purpose of giving Religious Instruction on express Days?

I do not; but I should hope that any Clergyman, whether he approved of the System or not, would feel it his Duty, for it is undoubtedly his Duty, to take care to give Religious Instruction to the Children who attended our Schools. I should be sorry to think that any Clergyman would do any thing so shocking as because Children went to our Schools to neglect affording them Religious Instruction.

To neglect to give that Instruction within the Schools?

No Part of our System requires that the Religious Instruction shall be given in the Schools. Our Rules require that a Time shall be set apart for enabling the Clergy of the respective Denominations to do what we conceive is their Duty, to instruct the Children of their respective Denominations in the Creeds they profess; they have a Right, according to our Rules, to require that an Opportunity shall be given them for instructing the Children in the

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Schools; they have also an Opportunity afforded them for instructing the Children out of the Schools, not only upon Sundays, but upon one Day in the Week besides.

When you say "out of the Schools" do not you mean out of the School Hours, or out of those Hours in which there is generally united Education, but in the Schoolhouse?

No; our System does not require that. One of our Rules I think expressly states that the Religious Instruction may be given either in the Schoolroom or in any other Place. Our Duty is to afford Facilities; not to provide the Instruction; we are not allowed to do that.

May not that Rule of the Board have induced Persons in the North of Ireland, and, generally speaking, in the Community, to imagine that there is an Indifference with regard to Religion on the Part of the Board of Education?

I do not think that any Person who considered our Rules with Candour could by possibility come to the Conclusion that we were indifferent to Religion; whoever reads our Rules must see that we lay peculiar Stress upon the Importance of Religious Instruction.

You have stated that it is the Duty of the Clergy to attend to the Religious Instruction of the Children; under this Mode of setting apart a single Day for the Instruction of those Children in the Parishes of such great Extent as the average Extent of Parishes in Ireland is, and where there may be Schools to the Amount of Six or Seven in a single Parish, is the most laborious Clergyman likely to be able to give an efficient Religious Instruction to the Children of those Schools?

I think he might make an Arrangement which would enable him to do so.

Is he more likely to be able to give an efficient Superintendence to the Religious Instruction of those Children if assembled in Schools than if scattered over the Parish and not collected in Schools?

Certainly.

Are there not Catholic Clergy in the Neighbourhood pretty much in proportion to the Number of Catholic Communicants; that is, in all Parishes a Catholic Clergyman has Two Curates; and could not those Curates aid him in instructing the Children in different Schools or in the same School?

Undoubtedly.

In the same Way, where there is a large Protestant Population it may be supposed that a Protestant Clergyman has always a Curate, and therefore is there not Reason to suppose that Ministers of the different Churches are to a certain Degree proportioned to the different Communicants?

I presume so.

Do not you conceive that the Scripture Lessons, as they are read in your Schools at the stated Hours of ordinary Instruction, must to a certain Degree come in aid of the supposed Religious Instruction that is given by the several Pastors or Masters out of the Schools?

I do. I take the Liberty of adding, that I do not conceive there was any Means of Religious Instruction, according to the Principles of the Established Church, provided in any Schools formerly supplied by the State in Ireland, except the Schools under the Association for the Suppression of Vice and the Charter Schools; there was none in the Schools under the Kildare Place Society. The Course pursued as to Religion in the Schools of the Kildare Place Society was that which has been so decidedly, as I understand, objected to by the Prelates of the Established Church in England. It consisted of the mere reading of the Scriptures, to the utter Exclusion of Catechism or Exposition of any Sort or Kind. Now I think I could show that the System of the National Schools in England, which I apprehend I may call the Church of England System, may be enforced in point of Principle in every one of our Schools which is attended by Protestant Children, if the Protestant Clergyman of the Place desired it, but not in the Schools of the Kildare Place Society. We insist on the Right of Clergymen approved of by the Parents to give Religious

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Religious Instruction in the Schools; the Kildare Place Society did not, I think, do so.

You have stated that in the Kildare Place Society Schools there is no further Facility for Religious Instruction than in the Board Schools?

There was no Facility for Religious Instruction afforded in the Schools of the Kildare Place Society beyond the mere reading of the Scriptures, to the Exclusion of Note or Comment, and of the Catechism and Liturgy of the Established Church or any other.

Will you now say whether the Board itself does not treat the reading of the Scriptures as Part of the Religious Instruction in its own Book?

I consider the reading of the Scriptures a proper Part of Religious Instruction; but according to my Notions as a Roman Catholic it ought not to constitute the whole of Religious Instruction, and I should be afraid if it were insisted upon, and every thing else as to Religion were positively prohibited, that the Children might regard it as the One Thing needful, and be encouraged to think that every thing else was Matter of Indifference.

You are not asked an Opinion about the Value of that Instruction, but whether in point of fact the reading of the Scriptures is not admitted by the Board itself to be a Part of Religious Instruction?

Undoubtedly.

Then the Schools under the Kildare Place Society do give so much more of Religious Instruction than the Board Schools give as the reading of Scripture without Note or Comment may amount to, be that Amount great or small?

I do not consider that the reading of Scripture in the Way in which I have seen it practised in the Kildare Place Schools does give so much of Religious Instruction to the Children,—I speak solemnly and conscientiously,—as they get in general in our Schools through our Scripture Lessons. I found, when I was going through Ireland in 1824, 1825, and 1826, that in many of the Schools the Children went on reading over and over again the same Part of Scripture, without knowing the Meaning of what they read at all; I found them in other Schools getting by heart particular Parts of Scripture, and yet knowing nothing of sacred History in general,—knowing nothing of the great Events that are recorded in Scripture, and very little of the Precepts it contains.

But be the Value of Scripture Instruction what it may, without Note or Comment, in so far as the Kildare Place Society gives the reading of the Scriptures without Note or Comment it exceeds the Quantum of Religious Instruction given under the Board's System?

I think not. I do not consider the mere reading of a few Verses of the Testament, a formal reading of it, to amount to any thing that can be called Religious Instruction; and this would satisfy the Kildare Place Rule.

Was it not in many Schools and in most of the Schools the Fact, that to comply with the Rule of the Kildare Place Society a Chapter of the Testament was read just before the Boys separated?

I believe that to have been the Practice in many Schools.

Have not the Schoolmasters under the System now established the Right and are they not ordered to explain the Extracts to the Children?

They are authorized to explain the Extracts to the Children, in like Manner as they would explain any other Work to them, that is to say, so far as to make them comprehend the Meaning of the Words and Sentences they read.

Are there not Notes to those Extracts?

There are.

Are not those Notes intended to direct the Masters as to the Explanations they may give?

No; the Notes are not intended for that Purpose.

But the Masters are not prohibited from giving the Explanation according to the Notes?

No.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Then in Cases where the Master is a Protestant or where he is a Roman Catholic may not the Master give an Explanation of the Extracts different from the Tenets of the other Persuasion?

Undoubtedly he may, and that might be urged as an Objection to any System by which Children of different Communions are brought together, for it is impossible to find any proper Works for Children that will not have some Reference to Religion; if then the Person who is teaching them is desirous to insinuate his own Doctrine he will be sure to find an Opportunity of doing so.

Was not that guarded against in the Kildare System?

It was guarded against in the Kildare Place System in such a Way as to render the reading of the Scriptures utterly nugatory. I have myself examined many Children in the Kildare Place Schools and others called scriptural whom I found utterly unable to give a rational Answer to the most simple Question that could be put to them. I have asked who our Saviour was, and they could not tell me. Then I have spoken to the Master, and he has said, "I can give them no Explanations, Sir." I have asked Children, who was Jesus Christ, and I have been answered by one Child that he was a Scribe, by another, that he was a Pharisee, and so on. In short, I found the grossest Ignorance amongst the Children as to the Meaning of what they were reading. I consider that one of the Consequences of making Children read the Testament without Instruction.

If you found that any of the Teachers had been in the habit of going into the Difference between the Two Tenets upon doctrinal Points when he was instructing the Children, would you consider that a Violation of their Duty?

Most undoubtedly; and he should not remain Master a Moment, or I would not remain on the Board.

But if one of the Notes led to that, would you think that he had transgressed his Duty?

If there were Notes to that Effect I should consider them improper.

Do not you believe that there are Notes attached to the Scripture Extracts that give an Opportunity to the Master, in explaining those Notes, to enter into an Explanation of the different Tenets of the Two Churches?

I do not think that the Notes in general afford him any Opportunity of doing so more than he would have in the Use of the Scriptures, or in the Use of Extracts, or in the Use of any Work which had reference to Religion. If a Man be desirous of doing the Thing he will find an Opportunity of doing it. Our best Security is in the Character of the Persons we employ, and their Knowledge that they would be discharged if they attempted to interfere with the Religion of the Children, so as to insinuate any peculiar Views of their own.

Do those Notes refer to the peculiar Doctrines in dispute, or is the Object of them to explain Difficulties that may arise, and not doctrinal Difficulties?

The Notes in general go to explain Difficulties that may arise; but there are One or Two Notes which may be considered doctrinal; for instance, the Translation of the Scriptures approved of by the Roman Catholics is, as your Lordships are aware, from the Latin Vulgate, the Consequence is that there are Differences between it and the Version of the Established Church, which is taken from the Greek. The Word rendered Repentance, according to the Translation from the Greek Testament is rendered "Penance" or "Penitence" according to the Translation from the Vulgate. Now in our Lessons, where we use the Word for the first Time, we render it Repentance, and we add a Note which states, that "Penance" in the Roman Catholic Church means "Repentance," that is to say, a Sorrow for Sin with Purpose of Amendment, and also a Disposition to manifest that inward Sorrow by external Works, or something to that Effect. That Note may be said to relate to doctrinal Matter; the Object of it however is, as your Lordships will observe, not to raise any controversial Question, but to show that there is no substantial Difference between the Two Versions.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

As you state that there are but One or Two Notes of that Character, all the other Notes being for the Purpose of the Explanation of the Words, do not you think that it might be desirable to expunge those few Notes from the Book?

There would be a Difficulty in expunging them, for this Reason; the Notes are to satisfy the Roman Catholics that their Translation of the Scriptures is not substantially abandoned. Our Object is to make the Roman Catholics and Protestants, as far as we can, understand, that though there are verbal Differences in the Translations, there is no substantial Difference; that has been our Object, I can sincerely say, throughout.

If the practical Evil results from it that it gives an Opportunity to a Schoolmaster to enter upon doctrinal Points, and that it is the only Instance in that Book in which such an Opportunity is given, do not you think that it would be desirable to expunge it?

We must balance Advantage against Disadvantage.

Do you think that the Advantages are in favour of it?

I do; I think it has reconciled the Roman Catholic Body to the Adoption of the Phrase Repentance instead of Penance.

Do not you think that it has had a strong Tendency to discourage the Protestant Clergy from co-operating with the Board?

I can sincerely state that I have never heard that it has.

Have you never heard that it was made an Objection to the Book of Extracts?

No, I never have.

Have you heard that an Objection was raised upon that Passage, from its being supposed, as stated positively in Speeches, that the whole Passage was omitted, and that upon that Account the Objection was made?

I have hitherto understood that the Objection was founded upon a Misapprehension of the Work; that it was supposed that we had omitted the Word "Repentance" altogether; whereas what we have done is, to use the Word "Repentance," and then to add a Note explaining why we use it in order to satisfy Roman Catholics upon the Subject.

The Committee call your Attention to the Ninth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, Page 47. Will you have the goodness to look at the very Top of the Page: "Is it not the Fact that the Word 'Repentance' does express the Roman Catholic View, but that the Word 'Penitence' does not express the Protestant View?" The Answer is, "Protestants have generally taken up the Notion that what we mean by 'Penance' is external Works, such as fasting and long Prayers. Now that is called Penance, because we suppose it is to be accompanied by a true penitential Spirit, without which external Works are worth nothing, but accompanied by that Spirit we think they are worth a great deal. They have taken up the Idea that it means merely fasting. I hope this will not be taken amiss. They merely think that it means external Works alone; that is not the Fact; that would be a downright Error, and a very dangerous one; there is no such thing as a Remission of Sins without a true Conversion of Heart, call it what you please.—(*Dr. Murray.*) I think in a Harmony in many Places where the Word 'Penance' is used the Word 'Penitence' might be substituted. (*Dr. Curtis.*) Undoubtedly it might.—Would a Harmony that left out the Word 'Penance' altogether where it occurred be one that would be acceptable to Roman Catholics?—No, certainly not." You will see that that seems to be a little irreconcilable with what has taken place in the Note to which you refer, where it is said that the Word "Penance" shall be left out altogether and the Word "Penitence" substituted?

If the Word "Penance" were entirely omitted, there being no Note of Explanation, it would be irreconcilable with what has been read.

But that is your Answer, that it is reconcilable with the Note?

Yes.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Do you continue to affirm that in your Judgment the Evidence of Dr. Murray in the Ninth Report is reconcilable with the Passage in the Third Report, to which your Attention was called on the former Day, in the Way stated in your Answer?

I think it is. I beg leave to observe, that the Third Report had reference to a particular Letter of Dr. Murray, and to his whole Examination. The particular Letter referred to is not the Letter which was referred to in a former Question put to me. The Parts of his Examination which it appeared to the Persons who signed this Report necessary to have before the Lord Lieutenant, to whom they made the Report, are given in the Appendix to it; and I think the Evidence and the Letter completely sustain what is said in the Report upon the Subject.

Do you continue to affirm that in your Judgment the Evidence of Dr. Murray in the Ninth Report is reconcilable with the Assertion in the Third Report of the present Board, in the Way stated in your previous Answer?

I do. I now beg leave to refer to what is stated in the Third Report upon the Subject. The Report speaks of a Publication which misrepresents an Answer given by Dr. Murray before the Commissioners of Education in 1825, and does so for the Purpose of making it appear that he had forsworn himself when he assented to our Scripture Lessons. The Publication states, that the following Question was put to Dr. Murray: "Supposing that Portions of Scripture should be extracted in the Words of the Protestant Authorized Version, for instance, would there be any Objection to this being used equally by Protestant and Roman Catholic Children?" To this it is stated that his Answer on his Oath was: "I think that if any Words attributed to our Saviour were given under any other Form than that which is set down in the Douay Version an Objection would lie against it. As to Extracts, if they are given as Scripture it must be remembered that we have all along said we could not propose to the Children any thing as Scripture except what is taken from our own Version." Now what is thus given, and marked with inverted Commas, as Dr. Murray's Answer to a particular Question, is made up of his Answer to that Question and of Part of an Answer which he gave to another Question. The other Question had reference to a Book which was put into Dr. Murray's Hands, and as to which he was asked: "You will be so good as to observe that in the Title Page there are these Words—"extracted from the Holy Scriptures," and that though the Form of Verses is not preserved, there is not in fact the slightest Deviation from the Language of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. Assuming now that there are no Points of Doctrine referred to in the Passages extracted, we should beg to know whether you conceive it to be admissible or inadmissible in the Schools of general Instruction." Dr. Murray's Answer was, "I conceive it to be admissible; it purports only to be compiled from Scripture. As to the other Extracts, if they are given as Scripture, it must be remembered that we have all along said we could not propose to the Children any thing as Scripture except what is taken from our own Version." Now, the latter Sentence, taken with reference to the one preceding it, bears a Meaning very different from that which the Publication alluded to endeavours to put upon it, by separating it from the Answer of which it forms Part, and transferring it to another; for the preceding Sentence shows that Dr. Murray considered the Work produced to him admissible, although the Title Page stated it to be extracted from the Holy Scriptures, and although in fact it was in the Language of the Authorized Version, provided there were no erroneous Points of Doctrine in it. It was not put forth in the Form of Scripture, that is to say, in Verses; therefore, provided there was nothing doctrinally wrong in it, Dr. Murray considered it admissible. The other Extracts spoken of by Dr. Murray were in the Form of Scripture, that is to say, in Verses, and to these he referred in speaking of what must be in the Words of the Douay Version. It is thus clear, considering the Context, that his Objection to a Work which departed from the Words of the Douay applied to one which should be in the Form of Scripture, not to such a one as ours, which is not given in the Form of Scripture, but is in the Nature of a Harmony; and yet the Object of the Quotation is to show, that to such a Work Dr. Murray made positive

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Objections upon Oath, and that in sanctioning it he has been guilty of Perjury. Our Work is conformable to the Vulgate, and being so, is free from Objection as to doctrinal Matter; it does not give the Matter, or purport to give it, in the Order or Form of Scripture; it therefore strictly accords with the Views expressed in Dr. Murray's Evidence. This was the Opinion I formed on reading the whole of Dr. Murray's Evidence, and I therefore joined with the other Commissioners in expressing it in our Report. I must observe here, that we were called upon to notice that Publication in question by His Majesty's Government. Thus we were obliged to go into it, and being so, we considered ourselves bound, one and all, Protestant and Roman Catholic, to vindicate Dr. Murray from the Imputation cast upon him, considering it not founded on Fact, but the contrary.

You have stated that when Dr. Murray underwent his Examination before the Commissioners of Education in 1824 there was no other accepted Translation conformable to the Vulgate; that it was the Douay only; but that since that Time this Publication which has been sent forth, having been used without Reclamation on the Part of the Roman Catholic Bishops, may, you think, be considered as an authorized Translation; that is still your Opinion?

It is my Opinion.

It is an implied Acceptance by the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland of the Scripture Extracts, inasmuch as they have been generally used in Schools with their Knowledge, and without Reclamation on their Part, which gives the Character of an authorized Translation to this Work?

I think so, in like Manner as the previous Acceptance had given that Character of an authorized Translation to the Douay Version.

Had all the Bishops thus accepted the Work?

I believe there are Schools in every Part of Ireland over which the Bishops could exercise some Control in which those Extracts are used.

Then if any single Bishop had reclaimed the Work would not have had this Character?

I will not say what would have been the Effect of any single Reclamation.

When was this Character acquired of an authorized Translation; how long after the Use of the Books in the School?

I cannot give a precise Answer to that. I consider, inasmuch as the Scripture Extracts have now been for a considerable Time in use in the several Schools, that that Character is now given to them.

Then at first it had not that Character?

I should consider that it had the Character at first in Dr. Murray's own Diocese.

But that it had not the Character of an authorized Translation in Ireland at first?

Undoubtedly not, until it became generally received through the Country.

And then it had?

And then it had.

How then can it be said that this was an authorized Translation in Dr. Murray's Diocese when the Bishops in general had given no Opinion upon it?

I take it that a Bishop is competent to give a Sanction to any Translation of the Scriptures in his own Diocese, provided it be conformable to the Vulgate.

Then the Assent of the other Bishops must be inferred from their not having objected?

It must be inferred from their concurring, I think, in the general Use of the Extracts.

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

Then they had not concurred in the general Use of those Extracts when those Extracts were first used in the other Dioceses?

They could not concur in the Use until they did concur in the Use.

How then do you reconcile the Concurrence of Dr. Murray in the Book recommended by the Board at first and before it had acquired Authority by Use without Reclamation on the Part of the other Bishops?

He gave his own Sanction, which for his own Diocese was sufficient, and he did not insist that it should be used in any Diocese. The Extracts which were previously proposed were Extracts the reading of which was to be enforced throughout the Country, and the Prelates could not agree that any thing should be enforced throughout the whole of their Dioceses which had not the Sanction of the whole of them.

Have you not Reason to believe that Dr. Murray communicated with other Members of his own Church before the Extracts were adopted?

I am not aware that he did. If Dr. Murray was to give his Sanction to a Work, which Work was to be enforced throughout the Country, I am sure that he would first communicate with the other Bishops; but it is optional with them to adopt our Work or not.

Having read the Evidence with respect to the Word "Penitence" or "Penance," and having seen that that was a Subject of Discussion at that Time, do not you consider that the Note which has been introduced upon that Word must lead to doctrinal Explanation on the Part of the Masters of Schools?

Not farther than the Note distinctly and expressly goes; that it states what the Roman Catholic Doctrine is, but it does not go into the Question whether the Doctrine be right or wrong.

Does it not enable the Master, if he thinks proper, to go into any Explanation upon it?

I do not think that it does, beyond stating the Matter in the Note, that the Roman Catholic Word "Penitence" includes the Protestant Word "Repentance;" and the more, that Protestants and Roman Catholics can be made to understand that there is Ground of Agreement between them, the better according to my Feeling.

The Roman Catholic Doctrine admits that Repentance is necessary; it adds something more, and says, that that is to be evidenced by some external Act?

Yes.

Have the Masters of the Schools received any Instructions as to the Limit of their Explanation upon that or any other Point?

I do not think that they have; but it is a clear Understanding that they are not to go into controversial Questions.

Have those who have received Education in the Model School received any Instruction with regard to the Instruction they are to give?

They may be said to receive such Instruction, as they hear the Scripture Extracts read, and are examined upon them, and they hear the Children read them, and see them examined upon them. I go myself, sometimes, and order a Class to be called up, and examine them. I have done the same Thing in other Schools throughout the Country.

Is it not possible that a Master seeing a doctrinal Point in this Work may feel himself authorized to enter into doctrinal Points?

It is possible that he may do so; but I do not think that the Masters could believe themselves warranted in doing it; but if it be conceived that any farther Rule should be promulgated by us, or any thing else done to prevent any such Act, I think I may say that the Commissioners would be most anxious to do whatever may be deemed right for the Purpose. From what has passed To-day I see that Apprehensions may be entertained of which I was not aware before, and so far as I am concerned I should be happy to join in any proper Act that would remove all ground for them.

When

Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

When Complaints are made to the Board, either against Teachers or Patrons and Managers of Schools, for Misconduct or Improprieties of any Kind towards Individuals, is an Opportunity given by the Commissioners in all Cases to the Complainant to establish his Complaint?

The constant Direction, when I have been present, has been, that there should be full and complete Opportunity afforded to the Complainant to do so; and I may say further, that where it has appeared to me necessary I have gone the Length of stating to the Board an Opinion, and the Board has acquiesced in it, that there should be a Prosecution.

Do the Board give the Complainant an Opportunity of stating his Complaint upon that Inquiry?

My Apprehension is, that Direction is always given to the Inspector so to do; I should think it a Mockery if that were not done.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

97

Die Lunæ, 13° *Martii* 1836.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

THOMAS FREDERICK KELLY Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Will you state what are your Duties as Secretary to the Commissioners of Education in Ireland?

To receive and answer all Communications, either by Letter or orally by Interview; to prepare for the Sub-Committee all Applications which come in for Aid; to sit in Sub-Committee with the Resident Commissioner for the Purpose of recommending what Aid should be granted; to bring up the Report of that Sub-Committee to the Board, and to communicate the Decision of the Board; to investigate Title for the different Trust Deeds which are necessary before the Board grant Aid for building Schoolhouses, and to see that these Trust Deeds are prepared accordingly; to superintend the general Details of the Office Establishment and the Department of the Inspectors.

Does all the Correspondence of every Description pass through your Hands?

It does.

Do you consider it your Duty to lay the whole of that Correspondence, whatever it may be, before the Commissioners?

I do.

Do you believe that since you have been in the Situation that you now hold your Practice has been quite uniform in that Case?

No, it has not.

In what Way have you deviated from it?

At first I deviated from it in this Way: whenever Letters came the Subject Matter of which had been at all before the Board in any former Communication I in that Case did not think that it was my Duty to take up the Time of the Board by asking their Directions a Second Time upon a Subject Matter of the same Nature, and those Letters therefore I answered myself; that is, in Cases where I was aware that the Board had laid down a Principle I answered Letters which regarded that Principle of myself, without communicating first to the Board. Again, where Letters came to the Board stating a particular Fact, and it appeared necessary that all the Circumstances of that Fact should be known, I have corresponded upon my own Motion in order to gain this Knowledge, and then brought the whole Correspondence regarding the Fact in all its Bearings before the Board; where I deviated in that, as in the former Instance, I have done so in order to save the Time of the Board. Again, many Communications respecting Title of Persons who gave Building Sites for Schoolhouses, in order to prepare the Trust Deeds properly, I never laid before the Board, conceiving that I might trust to the Exercise of my own Discretion, and not take up their Time with Points of that Kind. Those strike me at present as Instances in which I have deviated from the general Rule.

But in every Case in which you have considered it as new Matter you have in the first instance consulted the Commissioners?

I have; I am not aware in my Recollection of not having so acted in any one Instance.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

In any Instance that has occurred where Complaints have been made against Officers of the Board, what has been your usual Practice?
Invariably to bring these before the Board; I conceived that no Excuse could warrant me in not laying these before the Board.

Under any Circumstances, and against whomsoever that Complaint may have been made, you have always brought that before the Board?
I have.

In the Correspondence that has passed through your Hands, has any Intimation of extraordinary Violence committed on Schoolhouses or Schoolmasters been brought under your Notice?
There have been many Instances, and from an early Date.

Will you state any particular Cases of that Nature?
In the Year 1832, which was the Year after the Board was formed, the Dromlee Schoolhouse in the County of Down was wrecked by the Violence of a Mob, and, as I understood from the Inspector's Report, the Day or immediately after a Political Meeting had been held in the Neighbourhood; in January of the Year 1834 the Dressage Schoolhouse in the County of Tyrone was burnt down; in the September of 1835 the Beltoney National Schoolhouse in the County of Tyrone was burnt down; in the Month of November in the Year 1835 the Armaloughy National Schoolhouse in the County of Tyrone was wrecked. There were other Schools which were not destroyed, but closed because of the Intimidation from collected Mobs of People; namely, Laymere, Clinty, Galgorn, and Bridge-end, in the County of Antrim, and Drummaway in the County of Down. I have also Letters from the Correspondent of the Corbolly National School, County of Tyrone, stating that Violence was used with regard to the Schoolmaster there, to induce him to discontinue the School and to prevent the Children from attending it.

What is the Date of that Communication?
February the 23d and February 24th of this Year.

Those are Communications made to you as Secretary of the Board for the Information of the Commissioners?
They are; I received them since I came to London; they have been forwarded to me.

You have had no Opportunity of ascertaining the Truth of them?
No, not yet, and therefore I merely state them as Information received from the Correspondent.

Those other Disturbances took place in 1832?
Those in Drumlee only.

Where the Schools were closed?
That took place in the latter Part of 1833.

Have they been open since?
Galgorn and Bridge-end have not been opened since.

Of those Cases which you have stated to the Committee, how many have you had an Opportunity of obtaining the Facts?
The Facts have been obtained of all except the last.

And they have been found to be all substantially correct?
All of them; for we have Inspectors Reports, and the Inspectors do not report until they have actually visited the Place. There is another Case of Intimidation with respect to the Upper Tannybrake School in the County of Antrim, which occurred in the Year 1834; the Teacher of this School was beaten, and Notices of a threatening Nature were posted up; the Teacher however brought the Matter before the Quarter Sessions, where the Person who assaulted him being found Guilty was condemned to One Month's Imprisonment.

At what Period did that take place?
Previous to July 1835.

99

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Are all the Accounts of Money received and expended kept under your Superintendence?

No, they have not been so for the last Two Years; that is, from the Beginning of April 1835, up to which Period they were so kept; but since then there is an Officer employed for the special Purpose.

Will you state how that Department is conducted now?

Each Month the different Demands for Payment are collected and brought into a Sub-Committee, (consisting of Mr. Carlile, the Accountant, and myself,) upon the last Week of the Month, where they are strictly examined. These Demands consist of Grants which the Board have promised for building Houses or for fitting them up, or for Salaries, or for the different Items of Expenditure which have been rendered necessary. After these Demands have been thus fully investigated, and the different Vouchers respecting them examined, a Draft is drawn for the entire Amount of them; which Draft, with the Particulars of the Demands and the different Vouchers, is laid before the full Board on the following Thursday. The Board then underwrite this Draft, the Signatures of Three of the Commissioners to draw Money from the Bank being necessary. The Money thus drawn is transferred to the Credit of Mr. Carlile, who then pays off in Detail through the Accountant, by Drafts of his own, these several Demands. I should state that in the first instance the Monies which are voted by the House of Commons are lodged in the Treasury, from whence they are transferred in Sums of 5,000*l.* at a Time, and lodged in the Bank of Ireland to the Credit of the Commissioners. The Commissioners thus have never so large a Sum to their Credit in the Bank at any one Time as 10,000*l.*; their Balance is always below that Sum. This Money is drawn out in the Manner I have stated, by a Draft signed by Three of the Commissioners.

Do all Applications for Aid come through you?

They do.

Will you state what is your Practice when Applications of that Nature are made to you?

First to see that all the Queries are properly and correctly answered and signed by Applicants; for as the Applications come in the Shape of Answers to a certain Set of Queries, it is necessary to see that those Queries are answered in Correspondence with the Rules of the Board. Next, that all necessary Documents are attached to them; namely, if the Application be for building, that there are the proper Plan and Estimate attached; if for fitting up, that there is a proper Estimate; and lastly, that there is the Report of the Inspector upon the Case. The Application is considered complete when all these Points are satisfied, and is then with others, similarly examined, brought into Sub-Committee.

Have you one of the printed Query Sheets by you?

I have not.

Has this always been your Practice since the Commencement of the Board?

No, it has not. At first the Applications were brought immediately before the Board, and after the Lapse of about a Year they then were submitted in the first instance to the Sub-Committee in the Manner I have mentioned, but a previous Examination of all the Answers to see that they were correct, and that the different necessary Documents were attached, was always gone through. There have been Cases at first in which there was not so much Regularity observed: the Board improved in its Machinery as it got more Experience.

In some Cases where Schools have been placed in Chapel-yards, have those Applications come through you?

They have.

And have you been aware of the Circumstances of the Case before the Grants have been made?

Always; with the Exception, I think, of Two Cases; there were but these Two, I think, of which I was not aware; but I necessarily must be aware of that generally, for there is now a Question goes to that Point in our Queries.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Those Queries are framed by the Authority of the Board?
They are.

What are the Two Cases in which you state that Applications of that Sort were not brought under the Cognizance of the Commissioners?
They happened, I think, very early in 1832; I do not remember their Names, but they were Cases of Applications for Salaries to Schools, and not for building; and they got the Grant of Salary without the Board having the Knowledge of the Schools being in Chapels. At that Time, which, as I stated, was early in 1832, the Board had not adopted the Precaution which they afterwards did, of requiring the Inspector's Report in the first instance.

Are those Salaries continued?
No; the real Circumstances were found out upon Inspection, and the Schools were immediately struck off.

Can such a Case occur now?
It is impossible.

What do you mean by the Schools being held in Chapels?
The Children in the Two Cases referred to were assembled in the Chapel. The Application to the Board was merely for a Salary for a Teacher, and they described the Dimension of the Schoolroom, and there was no previous Inspection.

Have you not many Applications in Cases in which the Schoolhouses are so attached to the Chapels as to occasionally form Part of the Chapels?
We have had some; I cannot say many.

Have the Salaries been continued there after the Inspection by the Inspector?
They have in some Cases, and in some Cases they have been discontinued.

What is the Reason for the Distinction between the Practice of the Board in those Cases?
Where it was found that there was an internal Communication between the Schoolroom and the Chapel these Cases were struck off; where it was found that they were separated by Brick and Mortar, or by a Wall, that though they were Part of the same Building there was no internal Communication, the Salary was continued.

And those Cases in which the Chapel and the School are separated by Brick and Mortar are admitted freely?
Not freely; for this Reason, there is always an Intimation given to the Applicant to procure a Schoolhouse not so connected.

If, upon Applications of that Description, you find that they are for Schoolhouses in Chapel-yards, do you yourself make any Communication to the Applicants, or do you bring it in the first instance before the Commissioners?
Where the Application is for building a Schoolhouse the general Practice is to make a Communication to the Applicants to this Effect; namely, that, the Rule of the Commissioners being against it except in case of Necessity, they ought to try every Means first to get a Site for building a Schoolhouse elsewhere, and in some Cases I have put the Correspondent to a good deal of Trouble in seeking for such a Site.

Have you ever granted Aid for the building of Schoolhouses so attached to Chapels?
Not to my Knowledge or Recollection; we have granted Aid to the building of Schoolhouses in Chapel-yards, but not attached to Chapels.

What Step do you take to ascertain whether the Statement made to you is correct, that they can get no other Site; do you employ an Inspector?
We employ an Inspector always; but I cannot say that we employ the Inspectors particularly to sift the Truth of the Communications received upon that Point. But my Recollection of the Practice of the Board is this, that they are satisfied that those Men have tried as they state they have tried, and that they have failed where they have stated they have failed.

Have

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Have you ever called for the Letters between the Applicants and the Proprietors of the Land, by which you could ascertain that Application has been made and Refusal been given?

I think not, as I at present recollect.

Do you not recollect any such Letters having been laid before the Board, between the Applicants for Aid and the Proprietors of Land, showing what Negotiations have passed?

I cannot at this Moment bring it to my Recollection. I have had Occasion to lay before the Board, upon that Point, a Matter which was not so much a Letter as the Report of the Inspector, showing the Impossibility of getting Land for building Houses other than Chapel Land.

What do you mean by Chapel Land?

The Land upon which the Chapel stands. In the Parish of Errigle Trough a Declaration was printed and sent about, signed by Six of the resident Gentlemen of the Parish, to this Effect: "We, the resident Landed Proprietors of the Parish of Errigle Trough, feel ourselves called upon to declare, first, that we view with Regret the practical working of the new Board of Education in this Parish. Though we have ever encouraged and promoted a System in which all Denominations did willingly unite, we find our Schools opposed, a Suspicion thrown on our Motives, an unusual Disunion produced, and a rival Influence upheld, which claims more than we can concede. Secondly, that regarding the pure Word of God as the only Ground on which all Parties as Christians can meet, we deem it dangerous, in an Age of Irreligion and Infidelity, to throw aside that Word, or even weaken its Influence. We therefore declare that none of our Tenantry will receive Encouragement from us who are opposed to Schools founded on a Religious Basis. We look for moral and religious Men; we value in them Knowledge with Principle, and would give a View of God's Word to the industrious and poor.

(Signed) William Anketell.
Anketell Moutray.
Joseph Kane.
J. C. Moutray.
Thomas Singleton.
Roger Anketell.
Thomas Anketell."

Have you in any Cases granted Salaries to Persons belonging to a Nunnery?

We have.

Have you done that in many Cases?

Not in many; but we have in more than One or Two.

In what Places have those Schools been held?

They have been held in Rooms which have communicating Staircases or Doorways to that Part of the House which was altogether devoted to the Purposes of the Nuns.

Are there any particular Class of Nuns to which you have confined that?

No; the Board treats the Application proceeding from them in the same Manner as it treats Applications from others; and when their Queries have been correctly answered and signed, it treats it as it would an ordinary Case.

To your Knowledge have any Protestant Children come to these Nunnery Schools?

Not within my Knowledge.

You receive those Applications with equal Readiness from the Nunneries as from the Schools in general?

I conceive that the Board have made no Difference; for early in their Labours they had an Interview upon that Point with Lord Stanley, to determine whether they should receive these Schools or not; and that Point having been then decided in the Affirmative, they were looked upon as other Cases, provided that they answered the Questions properly, and complied with the Rules of the Board.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Was that Communication made by Lord Stanley to the Board?
There was a Communication between the Board and Lord Stanley in Conference.

You have no Document that you can produce of such Conference?
No.

Were you present at that Conference?
No.

Who were the Parties that reported that Conference to you?
I heard it mentioned at the Board generally; for instance, I heard Mr. Carlile and Mr. Blake mention it.

Did they mention that as having been present at that Conference?
They did; it was mentioned at the Board as a Matter of which I ought to be aware as the Secretary.

Did they state upon what Grounds Lord Stanley gave that Consent?
That he thought it useful that those Schools should be brought under the Superintendence of the Board and under their Inspection.

In what Manner do you conceive that the Board have the Superintendence over those Schools?
By sending their Inspector to visit and report upon them; by which Method the Board have the Means of ascertaining whether the Rules are observed or not.

How often does this Inspector make his Visits and report in the Year?
Generally about once a Year. I should say once a Year, with the Exception of particular Cases upon particular Occasions, when there may be Two Visits.

Then the only Control you had over those Schools was by Inspection once a Year on the Part of the Inspector?
Merely by Inspection; this is the only Control.

Had you Reason to believe that the Protestant Clergyman in that Parish would attend or superintend that School?
On that Point, namely, their Attendance on or Superintendence of the National Schools, they are left to the Exercise of their own Judgment.

Had you any Reason to believe that any Protestant Country Gentleman in that Neighbourhood would attend and superintend that School?
If they approved of our System we had as much Reason to believe that they would attend that School as a School held in any other Schoolhouse.

You were not aware of any Objection having been stated on the Part of any Protestant Clergyman or Gentleman, founded upon that particular Circumstance, as a Reason for his not visiting or as creating a Disinclination on his Part to visit?
I am not aware, as I recollect, of that having been stated.

Were there many of those Schools already established, or did the Board create any of them?
I am not aware that they created one; my Belief is that they had already been established for some Time before.

Did you happen to hear that Lord Stanley said that those were useful Schools and working well?
At the Board I heard it mentioned that in the Conference between him and the Board he stated that he considered these Schools useful, and that their being brought under the Superintendence of the Board would be judicious upon Principle.

In point of fact are those Schools within the Precincts of the Nunnery?
I should say yes. The Reason that I heard given for it was, that their Rules prevented the Nuns from leaving their own Precincts, and therefore that there was a Necessity for the Schoolhouse being within them.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Do the Rules of the Nunneries in Ireland enforce entire Seclusion of the Nuns?

Those of which I have obtained Information do in this respect enforce Seclusion of the Nuns.

In what Manner then could those Schools be visited by Men of any Religious Denomination but Priests?

The Access to the Schoolroom is from the public Room or from the public Street.

In all Cases?

With the Exception of One, I think, in which the Entrance is from the Yard at the Rear of the House; but that Yard has an Access from the public Street.

What is the Name of that School?

If my Recollection is correct, it is a Nunnery School in Newry.

And in all other Nunnery Schools there is a separate Access from the High Road?

For the Children, as far as I can understand, there is a separate Access, and for the Visitors.

Do you know of any Case in which the Visitors have been refused Access to those Schools?

None.

Do you know of any Case in which Visitors have attempted to go?

It is difficult for me to reply to that Question; I have had no Information that Visitors going were refused.

Do you know, in fact, that the Inspectors have examined those Schools, and made Reports upon them?

As regularly as upon any other School. I do recollect One Case that happened since Christmas, in which our Inspector visited such a School, not as Inspector, but being in the Town at the Time as a Stranger and in company with others, and that there was no Refusal to allow him or his Company Access.

Do you know whether he was obliged to ask Leave?

No, he was not.

Are the Inspectors Reports written or verbal?

They are all written.

Are they to be found in the Minutes of the Board?

No; they are to be found in Volumes by themselves; they are Answers to Queries.

Can their Lordships have those Reports?

They can.

In those Nunnery Schools are the Children all taught by Females?

They are.

What is taught?

Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, and the Scripture Extracts of the Commissioners. Their separate Religious Instruction I can give no Reply upon, that not falling within my Knowledge. Working with the Needle and Straw-plaiting are also taught, so as to make the Children industrious and useful.

Are the Persons who teach in those Schools the Nuns themselves?

They are.

How can a Male Inspector be admitted into those Schools?

They do admit them.

Is not that contrary to the Vow of Seclusion?

It is not the Vow of Seclusion from receiving Society which they take.

Are the Nuns allowed by their Vows to receive Male Visitors?

They have received Male Inspectors.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

In what Mode do the Board or can the Board superintend those Schools in the Nunneries?
By their Inspectors.

How often do the Inspectors go to visit the Schools?
Once in a Year.

At stated Times, or at any casual Period without Notice?
Without Notice always to the Schools, but at stated Times as to the Board, because the Board is necessarily aware of the Movements of their Inspectors.

But in point of fact the Inspectors have no Opportunity of knowing what Course of Education is pursued in those Schools, except the once or the twice in the Year that they go there under the Orders of the Board?
They have no other Opportunity. They have exercised those Opportunities thus: they examine the Register and the Report Book of the School; they also examine the several Classes of the Children, and ascertain their Proficiency, and by comparing it with that as recorded in the Report Book and at the former Inspection are enabled to see what Advancement is made by them. The Books that are in the Hands of the Children, and which are in the habit of being used in the School, are also inspected; and upon all these Things they report to the Board.

Is the practical System of Education pursued in those Schools open to the Inspection of the Public in any way, as in the other Schools of the Board?
It is; and accordingly over them, equally as over all the Schools of the Commissioners, a Board with the Words "National School" upon it is obliged to be hung up; and a Rule of the Commissioners gives a Right to Clerical Members of the different Denominations, though they did not sign the Application for Aid, to visit the School.

Have the Query Papers which you mention been sent to the Patrons of those Schools as well as to the others, and have they been answered?
They have been so sent, and equally have been answered.

Have you any Form of the Queries which the Inspectors are obliged to answer?
I have not one with me; I have one in London, which I will bring.

Is One of those Queries, whether any other Books are used in the School but those prescribed by the Board?
There is One Query upon that Point. The Query desires the Inspector to note down such of our Books as he finds in the School, with the Number of them. In point of fact the Query goes to this: that the List of our Books is printed opposite to the Question, "State what Books you find in the School?" and he is to note, by Figures opposite the Name of each of those Books, the Number of them which he finds there. Then the Query goes on thus: "State by Name what other Books there are?" and that Question draws out specifically the Name of any other Book, if any other Book there be there.

What Means do the Inspectors take of ascertaining that Fact?
Personal Examination, by looking into the very Books themselves.

Then they have no other Means than finding the Books in the Schools?
No; but they search out every Book in the School, on the Desk or in the Child's Hands.

In those Nunneries are the Hours of Religious Instruction confined as in other Schools?
Precisely; that is, it must be either before the School Business begins or after it is ended for the Day.

Upon what Authority does that Assertion rest?
Of course upon the Inspector's Report.

Do you know of any Difference between the Discipline exercised in Nunnery Schools and in the other Schools?
No.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Who are the Patrons of the Nunnery Schools?

Those who sign the Application for Aid. I cannot give your Lordships a very accurate Reply, because we assume that Persons are the Patrons of those Schools, equally as of the other National Schools, first, who apply by signing the Application to the Board for Aid; and next, who are more active than the rest of the Applicants, by conducting the Correspondence.

But in point of fact who have applied for Aid to those particular Schools?

I think that the Catholics and Protestants conjointly have signed the Query Sheet.

In those Nunnery Schools?

Yes. The Roman Catholic Clergymen almost always. The Lady who is the Superior of the Convent or the Religious House becomes generally the Correspondent in case of Nunnery Schools.

What is the last Date in which any Assistance has been given to the Nunnery Schools; is it recent, or was it only at the Commencement of the System?

Some of the earlier Applications were for Nunnery Schools; and I think, as I recollect, that they continued, but not numerously, through the Years 1834 and 1835.

Was the Assistance that was granted in the first instance confined to Nunnery Schools that had existed prior to the Formation of the Board?

My Impression is that it was so granted in every Instance, as well as I can recollect.

You have never given any Assistance to a new Nunnery School established since the Formation of the Board, have you?

Not to my Knowledge; my Impression is that they all existed before.

Have any fresh Applications been made to you for Nunnery Schools lately?

I think in the course of 1836. I cannot be positive upon that Reply, and it may be later.

Are there Boys taught as well as Girls in those Schools?

No; they are all Girls.

Have you any Knowledge of what is passing in the Nunnery Schools except through the Channel of the Inspectors?

We have no official Knowledge.

You spoke of a Correspondent just now who had given you Information respecting some Injury done to a School; of what Character was that Correspondent?

He is a Roman Catholic Clergyman.

Have you not such Correspondents with regard to the Nunnery Schools, Protestants and Catholics?

We have.

Do not they communicate with you upon that Point?

Their general Class of Correspondence is in reference to the Wants of the School, either in respect to Books or Money.

Are all the Answers you have given respecting Nunnery Schools meant equally to apply to Schools in Monasteries; with regard to the not building new Schools, and having all the same Superintendence over them as over other Schools?

Yes; I am not aware of the Board having granted to Monastery Schools Salary in any Case where that School had not existed before.

Have you known any Instance of the Board giving Aid to Buildings for Schools in Monasteries? You have said that you have not in Nunneries; have you in Monasteries?

No Question has been put to me respecting building Schoolhouses in Nunneries, but only about creating Schools. As to Monasteries, there is no Instance to my Knowledge or Recollection.

Could such a School have been built without your Knowledge?

I think not.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Have you any Reason to know the probable Number of those Nunnery Schools?

I have it not in my Mind; but I think a Return was made to the House of Lords upon that Point.

Do you know whether any Protestant Children attend those Nunnery Schools?

I do not know whether there are any or not.

You do not know that there are not any?

No.

But you have never heard that there are any?

In One particular Case, the Name of which I cannot bring to my Mind, I recollect there being either Three or Five Protestant Children in one of the Nunnery Schools.

You know that in the Applications made to the Board, in some Instances the Applications were signed by Protestants as well as by Catholics?

I do.

Was that a School in the County of Galway?

I cannot recollect.

Was that a Monks School?

No; I think that the School of which I have spoken was a Nunnery School.

In any Schools in Ireland in which, from the Absence of a Protestant Population, it is to be supposed that there are no Protestant Children, is it equally expected by the Board that during the Hours of moral and literary Education the Books provided by the Board should be used, and none other?

As the Rule of the Board is not to enforce the reading of the Books compiled by them, I can only answer the Question in this Way; that it is equally expected in these as in other Schools that no Books should be used of which the Board do not approve, and that no Books of an exclusive Character are to be used at all.

The same Rule applies to those as to Schools in which there are both Protestant and Roman Catholic Children?

Yes.

Where a School is built upon what you call Chapel Land, in whom is the Freehold?

A Difficulty has arisen upon that Point; the Grantor has in some Cases been the Parish Priest, claiming the Fee from the continued Possession of those who have preceded him. In other Cases, of which there are One or Two that I can now bring to my Recollection, the undisputed Owners of the Fee have made a Grant of it to Trustees for the Board.

In that Case who was the Owner of the Fee?

One of them was a School at Kilcock; Lord Cloncurry was the Owner of the Fee, of which the Chapel Ground was Part, and he made the Grant. Another was the School in Carrickmacross; the Owner of the Fee was a Layman; I cannot now remember his Name.

But in point of fact was the Parish Priest the Owner of the Freehold in the Case where the School was attached to the Chapel?

In many Cases they are.

With respect to Nunnery Schools, who is the Owner of the Freehold?

Generally, the Grants to these not being for building, the Commissioners do not look at the Title, and therefore do not ask that Question; I speak generally.

Do you know of any Instance of Aid having been withdrawn on account of the School having been attached to the Chapel?

I know of Cases in which the Aid has been refused for no other Reason than because the School was on Chapel Ground.

107

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Is there not in one of the Reports an Instance given of the Aid having been withdrawn on account of the School being on Chapel Ground?

In the Chapel School in Kilkenny Aid was withdrawn because there was communicating a Door between it and the Chapel, and Aid has been withdrawn in many more Cases than that. In the Wicklow School Aid was also withdrawn for the same Reason.

Will you prepare and produce a List of the Schools which are on Church, Chapel, or Meeting-house Ground, or connected with any House of Divine Worship?

I will.

Has there not been some Aid given towards furnishing Schools which have already been commenced on Chapel Ground?

There has.

And those have formed Exceptions to the Rule of not giving Aid on Chapel Ground?

The Answer I gave was this, that the Board did not give Aid to Schools built upon Chapel Ground except in Cases of Necessity; that the Board has refused to give Aid in the Case of Schools built on Chapel Ground.

In Cases where there has been no previous Inquiry as to whether Ground could be obtained elsewhere, they have in some Cases given Assistance where Schools have been begun?

They have; and even where Schools have not been begun they have given Aid in some Instances to build.

And without Inquiry?

No, not without Inquiry; but upon finding that no other Site could be obtained, and therefore that it was a Case of Necessity. The Case showed a District in want of a Schoolhouse, a Population without a School, and the Applicant came forward, stating that he would give us a Portion of his Chapel Land, and we directed an Inquiry to be set on foot for Ground elsewhere. In some Cases that has come directly from myself, in other Cases from the Inspector's Report, stating that he conceived that Ground could be got elsewhere. The Board never would consider the Application either to refuse or to receive it until the Result of this Inquiry made by the Applicant himself had been communicated to them; and then, if upon Consideration they found that it was impossible to obtain Ground elsewhere, they, in order that the Children might not be without a Schoolhouse, granted the Aid.

Mr. Carlile states, in an Answer to the Question, "Is any Assistance given to the Erection of Schools on Ground appertaining to Roman Catholic Chapels? —There were some Schools that were commenced to be built previously to the Establishment of the Board, and which had been proceeded with to a considerable Extent, at an Expense to the People; and one Reason why we granted them Aid in the finishing of those Schools was, that it seemed very hard that the People, after having partly built a Schoolhouse, should be applied to for another Subscription as their Contribution towards the building of a new Schoolhouse." Are you aware of any Instances of that?

I am.

And in those Cases no Inquiry has been entered into whether Ground could be obtained elsewhere?

None in those Cases.

In those extreme Cases where the Board are obliged to accept of Chapel Ground, does the Board in all Cases require that there shall be a separate Access to the School from the Highway?

They do, and they require that a separating Wall shall be built between the Schoolhouse and the Chapel.

Both the Chapel and the Chapel-yard?

Not the Chapel-yard, because it is all upon the Chapel-yard.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

In no Case is there a School built upon the Chapel-yard of which there is not a Door of Entrance for the Children and the Visitors from the Highway?
Not to my Knowledge.

Do the Committee understand you correctly to state that you required the Fee of the Ground where you granted Aid to Schools?
No; the Board has not required the Fee in every Case, nor has it the Fee in every Case.

Do the Committee understand that in no Case Salaries are granted to Schools within Chapel Ground where there is not Access to the School from the Highway?
My Impression is that there is not such a Case.

The Inspector would report upon it?
He would, I should expect.

And you would have been struck with the Fact, in all probability, if you had seen such a Fact stated?
I should.

Are the Inspectors instructed to make such a Report to you?
Their Report consists of Answers to a Number of Questions, and I think that that Fact should come out if the Inspector fairly reported.

It does not form one of the Questions?
There is no distinct Question upon that Point. The Commissioners do not anticipate particular Cases when they put these Questions, which are put more general.

You would conceive it to be the Duty of the Inspector, if aware of such a Fact as that existing, to report it to the Board?
Yes.

But as you state the Fact that the Board resolved that it would grant Aid in Cases where the separating Wall was built, was it not natural that you should make Inquiries of such Inspector whether the Wall had been built up or not; you stated that where there was a Communication between the Chapel and the School the Board refused to grant Aid till the Wall was built?
What I stated was this, that when the Board made a Grant for building, if on Chapel Land, they attach to it this Condition, that there should be a separating Wall between that Schoolhouse and Chapel, and of course a separate Access to that Schoolhouse from the High Road.

But you also stated that there were many Instances of Communication between the Chapel and the School?
Yes; those were in existing Schools.

Do not you require that that Communication should be closed, and an Entrance made from the Road?
In those Cases there was an Entrance from the Road, but we required the communicating Door between the School and the House of Worship to be closed.

Having done so, was it not natural that you should inquire of your Inspector whether that Order had been complied with or not?
So we did.

Did it form one of the Queries to the Inspectors?
No. I stated that in the Queries to the Inspectors there was none distinctly pointed to such a Circumstance; thus the Board not being made aware of that Circumstance may grant the Aid. But should the Inspectors report then, or afterwards state, that there is a Door of Communication, the Commissioners desire an Intimation to be made through me, stating that there is a Door of Communication with the Chapel, and if that is not closed they must refuse or withdraw their Aid. There was an Instance of the Kind in which Aid was applied for by the former Bishop of Killaloe; there was a Communication between the Vestry Room, which was used as the Schoolroom, and the Cathedral;

we

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

we required it to be made up by a Wall, and that was complied with, and then we granted Aid.

Do you speak from your own Knowledge when you say that that was complied with?
No; I speak but from Information.

Was it in the Vestry Room that the School was held?
My Impression is that it was in the Vestry Room.

Did you ever see that Schoolroom?
No, I never saw it; but the Impression upon my Mind is that that Order has been complied with.

You have not seen any one of those Schoolrooms of which you have spoken?
No, not one.

You speak from what you hear?
Yes; I have not seen a single School.

Was the Impression upon your Mind that that Order had been complied with?
It was.

In your Experience of the Applications that have passed through you, have they been bonâ fide Applications, or have you ever detected any that have been made with the Intention of imposing upon the Commissioners?
We have detected, I think, but One or Two; but my Impression of the Applications at large is, that they are decidedly bonâ fide. We detected One Case in November last; but my Impression is decidedly that the Applications are bonâ fide.

That in November,—what Description of Application was it?
It was an Application that had been made in 1834 to the Board for Salary for a Teacher, and I think made in the usual Way; Protestants and Roman Catholics had signed the Application, and a Name was signed to it of a Person who was alleged to be the Owner of the House. The Application being granted, a School was founded, and continued on the Board's Books till November, when a chance Circumstance led to this Discovery, that the Person who was the Owner of the Ground, and who was set forth in all the Documents as a Manager, had never applied, and had not known that the School was on the Board. Tullylamney was the Name of the School.

What do you suppose was the Object of that attempted Imposition?
I should conceive it to be for the Master to obtain a Salary from the Board.

When Aid has been given by the Board is it under your Charge to see that the School has been opened in a proper Way, according to the Queries and under the Direction of the Board?
It is, through the Inspector.

Do you in fact, before any Aid in Money is given to that School, see that that School is in full Operation according to the Queries?
Always, in respect of Salary; the Aid in Money in regard to the Salary is paid half-yearly, and before each Half Year Queries are sent to the School to be certified by the Manager and Correspondent, and these, when so certified, together with the Rolls of the Names and the Number of Children in attendance during such Half Year, are sent back to the Commissioners.

Who is the Member of the Board who superintends the due Application of the Funds?
Mr. Carlile.

You are particularly well acquainted with the Operation of the System; have you any Reason to suspect that separate Religious Instruction,—Religious Instruction either of the Protestant or Roman Catholic,—has been mixed up with the Moral and Literary Instruction in the Schools?
I have no Reason for believing that, but the Reverse.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Dr. M'Leod.

The Reverend NORMAN M'LEOD, D.D., is called in, and examined as follows:

You are Moderator of the General Assembly in Scotland?
I am.

Have you had any Experience in any Degree of the State of Education in Ireland?
I have.

Have you been in Ireland?
I have.

And have seen some of the National Schools in Ireland?
Not many; I saw some.

What are the Relations between the Kirk of Scotland and the Presbyterians in Ireland?
There is one Body of Presbyterians in Ireland connected with the Church of Scotland, the Synod of Ulster, and only one Body; and that Connexion is only since last May.

Then even the Seceders are not connected with the Church of Scotland?
Not with the Church of Scotland, but they are with the Seceders in Scotland.

The Seceders in Ireland as well as the Seceders in Scotland you consider to be orthodox, and the only Difference between them and you relates to the Question of Patronage?
Patronage, and some Matters of Church Government.

Are the other Classes of Presbyterians in Ireland of which you have heard, the Remonstrants, the Presbytery of Antrim, the Synod of Munster, and so on, considered orthodox or not?
We consider the Remonstrants especially,—we know them not to be so, upon their own Admission, because they went out of the Synod of Munster upon Matters of Doctrine. It was from the Knowledge that there were so many of them in the Synod of Ulster that we resisted any Union with the Synod of Ulster till they went out from among them in the Year 1827.

They refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith?
They did. It did not come to the mere Matter of the Signature of the Confession of Faith; it was not finally settled by the Synod of Ulster till last Year, and it was in consequence of that that we entered into an Union with the Synod.

Then either those Congregations or Individuals who refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith you have not Union with?
No.

What was the Object for which you went to Ireland?
I went to Ireland chiefly to get acquainted with the particular Dialect of the Celtic Language spoken in the West of Ireland and in some of the Northern Counties. I have been engaged for many Years, I may say all my Life, in Matters of Celtic Literature; and I was extremely anxious, and required to ascertain this Point, how far Licentiates belonging to the Church of Scotland speaking the Gaelic Language, or the Dialect that is spoken in the Highlands, could be useful as Missionaries in those Districts in Ireland where the Irish is spoken; whether our Scotch Gaelic could be understood by the Irish. That was very much the Object of my Visit.

By whom were you requested to visit Ireland for that Purpose?
I went at the Request of the Synod of Ulster. I met the Synod at Dublin, and I was requested by the Synod to give my Opinion upon that Point.

Had there been any general Application from the Synod of Ulster to the General Assembly in Scotland upon the Subject?
They had Communications from influential Members; I am not aware that there was any Communication from the Synod.

You went there by the Authority of the General Assembly as well as of the Synod of Ulster?

I had no distinct Authority from the Church, but I went at the Request of many influential Members of the Church.

To what Part of Ireland did you go?

To Galway and County Mayo and Derry.

In what Year was that?

1833.

In what Part of the Year?

The Beginning of August; it was in the Month of August, in the Harvest Season, but I cannot tell the precise Day; but I know that they were cutting down their Crops in Galway.

Did you see any of the National Schools in the Town of Galway?

I visited one of the National Schools in the Presentation Nunnery, I think they call it.

In what State did you find that School?

They were all Girls in the first Apartment of it, and there seemed to be a very great deal of Order and Decency in that Apartment, superintended all by Nuns.

Did they know who you were when you visited?

Yes, they did.

You had announced who you were?

I was accompanied by a Friar, a Clergyman, and I am sure he knew me well, for I breakfasted with him, and frequently had met him, and he introduced me.

Then he made it known who you were?

Yes.

Did you see any thing remarkable in the School?

The Children were learning the Catechism of the Church of Rome at the Time I went in, and I observed great Order.

At what Hour of the Day was it?

I think it was in the Forenoon, very soon after Breakfast, Eleven or Twelve o'Clock; I cannot precisely say.

Were you told that this was on a Day of separate Religious Instruction?

No; I did not ask; I know that they were engaged in the Catechism.

Did you see any Children engaged in any thing else?

In the upper Flat above that there were a great many Girls learning Embroidery and Needle-work; but whether they were connected with the National School or not I cannot say.

Was it under the same Roof?

Yes, but a Floor higher.

Do you recollect what Day of the Week it was?

No.

Are you aware whether there were any Protestant Children in that School?

I understood that there were none. There are not many Protestants in Galway altogether; but I understood that there were none there.

There was a Door into this School from the Street, was there?

The Presentation Nunnery is in a Park.

Then there was no Entrance to the School from the Street?

It is a considerable Distance from the Street altogether; it was in a Park.

In an Inclosure?

In an Inclosure.

You could not get into this School without going within the Inclosure in the Nunnery?

Certainly not.

Dr. M'Leod.

Was this School within the Inclosure of the Nunnery so situated that you could not go into it without going within the Gate, and without encountering the Porter?

We found the Gate of the Park that led up into the Nunnery, which was a very handsome Building, open, and we went up, and having a Friar along with me, I found no Difficulty of any Sort.

In the Schoolroom was there the Board "National School" over the Door?

I recollect distinctly reading the Words "National School" over the Door as I entered the Apartment.

Was that on the Outside?

Yes.

Did the Schoolroom open to the Outside of the Nunnery Door?

The Schoolroom, so far as I recollect, was in a Wing of the Nunnery.

The Door of the Schoolroom was on the Outside, so that you went from the open Air into the Schoolroom?

I am quite certain that we did enter a Lobby or Passage which led to the School; I was brought in that Way, but I was led out another Way, as the Friar wished to introduce me to the Superior of the Nunnery.

Did you go to any other National School in Galway?

I did.

What School was that?

It was a School where there were Boys under the Charge of some of the Monks.

Was that in a Monastery?

It was called a Monastery.

Was the Entrance to that School from the Street?

It was a large square Building with a Court in the Inside; and I understood that it was at one Time Barracks belonging to the Government purchased and appropriated for this Purpose.

Then you were obliged to go within the square Court before you could get at the School?

It was a square Court, from which different Doors opened to different Apartments.

You were obliged to go within this Square to get into this School?

Yes.

Was there any general Gate to the Monastery?

No; I do not recollect that there was.

Was the Schoolroom on the Ground Floor?

No; I think it was up One Story or Two; it was up Stairs.

Did you find any thing particular in or near the School?

From never having been in Roman Catholic Countries I was anxious to see the working of the System there. There was a small Chapel just as I entered the School on my Left Hand; some Crucifixes were hanging, and Two Candles burning at the Time; I know that there were Two, if not more; and I understood that it was a small Chapel connected with the entire Establishment; I did not like to show any improper Curiosity, and I passed along.

All the Children in entering the School must pass the Door of that Chapel?

They must.

Were those Monks Clergymen?

I understood that they were.

Did you understand whether there were any Protestants in that School?

I did not inquire of the Teachers, but I inquired in Galway, and understood that no Protestant Children were in any of the Schools.

In

Dr. M'Leod

In what State did you find that School?

I was told that it was near the Time of Dismissal; but what struck me most was the Circumstance, I spoke to the Friar that accompanied me,—and who seemed to be a remarkably intelligent Man,—as to Part of the System, and he told me that I might ask any Questions myself; that he did not like to ask any; it appeared to me that they kept shy of each other; and some Person who appeared to be of Authority there,—I was introduced to him by the Friar,—drew my Attention to a very large Globe of the Earth that the Teacher had made, and spoke a great deal of the Talent of the Teacher and his Ingenuity.

Did he seem to do so to prevent your inquiring about the School?

I do not know what his Object was, but that was the Impression made upon my Mind at the Time, for I said I was very anxious to hear the Children read an English Lesson.

Did you hear them read English?

No, I did not.

Why?

I was told that they were about to dismiss; there was a great Confusion and a great Want of Arrangement, apparently.

Did he seem to have a Wish that you should not hear them read?

He certainly did. I asked the Teacher if he would have any Objection to my hearing them read some Book when they were engaged in their Lessons; that I was anxious to hear Irish Boys read English, to see how they approached the Mode in which they read English in the Part where I came from; how the teaching of English answered in Ireland, as we found it of so little Importance in Scotland.

What did he say to that?

He said that they were anxious not to see many Strangers; that it confused them; that it interrupted the Children; but that he had no Doubt that I might get back if I particularly wished it, or wrote a Letter.

Did he know you were a Clergyman?

Yes; but I have no Doubt that I would have got back if I had felt any Desire about it; but they knowing me to be a Protestant Clergyman I felt a Delicacy.

He rather discouraged you than otherwise?

Yes.

Did you hold any Communication with the Children at all?

Not in the School, but out of Doors I did.

Not with those Children?

No, for the Friar was with me.

Did you go to any other School?

Not in Galway, for those were the only Schools, as I learnt. My great Object was, as all the Children spoke Irish, that I might know how the teaching them English answered.

Did you go anywhere else after that?

I went from Galway to Westport in the County of Mayo; at least it was the first Place after that that I entered a Schoolroom.

What Schools did you visit there?

I visited the National School, a large handsome Building that was erected.

What did you find there?

I went, unaccompanied by any Person, first to the upper Apartment, where the Female Children were taught, and there seemed to be a good deal of Order. The Lady who had the Charge of them seemed to have more System than I had seen in any School in the Country.

What were they learning?

Their Catechism.

Did they tell you that that was the Day for separate Religious Instruction?

She told me that they had not got Books, but that they expected them.

Dr. M'Leod.

Were they repeating the Catechism?
Yes; she had one in her Hand, and was asking them Questions.

Then she told you that the only Book she had was the Catechism; was that so?
I asked what other Books they had, and she seemed rather agitated, as I was a Stranger; and she said that her greatest Wish was to give them Religious Instruction.

Was this in a Nunnery?
No.

Did you understand from her that they had no other Books, and that that was the Reason why they were using the Catechism?
No, I do not remember that she said that they had no Books; but that they had not as yet been regularly engaged in a Course of teaching.

Did you go to any other School?
I went to the School below in the lower Apartment, which was taught by one of the Teachers; a School for Boys.

What did you find there?
I went in, and there was great Confusion and Want of Discipline and Arrangement, and he seemed to be a little eccentric in his Manner, and there was a great deal of Peculiarity about him; and I told him that I was from that Part of Scotland where the Irish was spoken, and I was anxious to know the Character of the Irish spoken in that Part of his Country, and I begged of him to call up the most advanced Class to read English; and he said, "We have really, Sir, not arranged them in Classes, and they are very wild Boys, and it takes a long Time to arrange them."

This was in the Harvest of 1833?
Yes; I think it was in August.

In the Return of the Amount of all Sums granted by the New Board of Education in Ireland, dated the 16th July 1832, there is a School entered at Westport; do you believe that to be the School?
Yes, there being no other in Westport.

Did he tell you when the School was opened?
No, he did not; but he told me that he had not the Matter then arranged. I urged him to get up a Class; that I was very anxious to hear them read English; and he hesitated very much, and said that he had not formed them into Classes. I said, "Call up Half a Dozen;" and he called up a few by Name; and he got either Five or Six; but no more than that Number stood up.

What Books had they?
They had Copies of Æsop's Fables. I told him to get any English Book, and I looked for a Book, and found a Copy of Æsop's Fables, and they read a Fable.

You put this Fable into their Hands?
Either I or he; we found it, and I said that would do as well as any other to serve my Object.

Did the Boys read it?
They read a Fable.

Did they seem to read it as intelligent Boys?
Yes, they read it loud and very distinctly; at least very distinctly.

Did he tell you how long the School had been opened?
I did not ask him.

Did you ask the Boys any Questions about the Fable?
When they had read the Fable I asked them to close the Book, and to give me the Substance of the Meaning of what they had read in English; and the Boys looked at me, and seemed not to understand it; and I said to the Teacher, "They do not seem to understand my strong Highland Accent; will you tell them what I wish them to do; to give me the Meaning in their own Way?"

and

and he laughed very heartily, and said, "They cannot do it; to be sure they cannot do it;" and I asked, "Why?" and he said, "They have not a Word of English; they are Irish Boys, those, and they have no English;" for Two ran away; and I seized upon the Two who were the finest, tallest, and healthiest Boys; and he said, "They have no English; they are Irish Boys;" and I said, "Do you understand the Irish so well as to explain to them?" and he said he had no Irish. The Boys had no English, and he had no Irish; and I then just simply asked the Man, "And, pray, what is the Good of this teaching? They are learning to read what they do not understand, and which you do not explain to them;" and he said, "Indeed, Sir, I do not know." But that was my particular Object, to know what Good was done by the teaching of English in Irish Districts.

What Number of Boys did there appear to be there?
There were a great Number.

100?
I should suppose there must have been more than 100. I should rather say the Impression upon my Mind was that there were 200; but there were whole Benches of Boys without any Book of any Kind in their Hands.

Were they summing; did they appear to be employed in any thing of that Kind?
No; he said it was a great Matter to break them into Habits of Obedience, for they were very wild Boys.

Did he appear to have been successful; were they in order?
Not at that Time.

Did you infer from that that the School had not been long in meeting?
It appeared to be a Muster of Boys in the opening of the School, for I have seen something of the same Kind in the Highlands.

Your Object being to ascertain how far Missionaries from Scotland could be of Use in that Part where the Irish lived, have you Reason to know that the Irish do receive with Favour the Endeavours to instruct them through their Native Language?
I have always understood that they have the most ardent Desire of learning their own Language, and I had good Proof of it in my own Experience in the Districts where Irish is taught, by the Reception of a Book which I prepared, —the Psalms of David in Irish Metre. They had never had the Psalms of David in Irish Metre, and believing them to be People fond of Poetry and Music, I always thought that if the Psalms were prepared in Irish Metre they would receive them as a great Boon, and knowing the Love the Highlanders have for it, who are a People of the same Character, talking a Dialect of the same Language,—knowing the Love or Enthusiasm they have for Sacred Poetry, I believe the Irish have the same; and the Demand for this Work is in those Districts where the Irish Schools are held, as will be expected.

What is your Notion of the most expedient Mode of teaching the Children of the Poor in the West of Ireland, where it is understood that a very large Proportion of the People speak Irish only?
I am quite satisfied, from the Experience I have had of the People of the same Character, of the same Habits, speaking the same Language, that the only effectual Method that can be taken is to instruct them through the Medium of their own Language.

Have you had Reason to inquire into the supposed Number of Irish who speak Irish only?
It was one of the most special Inquiries I made wherever I went, and I have been in Correspondence on that Subject with Persons of many Parts of Ireland.

What is the Result to which you have come as to the Number of Persons in Ireland who speak Irish only?
The Friends of vernacular Instruction are disposed to make the Numbers greater than I think they are, while the opposite Party make them less than I think they are. The Conclusion I have come to, and not myself only, but

Dr. M'Leod.

others engaged in the same Object, is, that there are from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 who can receive Religious Instruction through the Medium of their own Language only; they may have a Commercial Language, and bargain and sell and buy at Markets, but I believe that there are that Number incapable of receiving Religious Instruction but through the Medium of their own Language.

Then this is not confined to the West of Ireland, but there are Parts in the North of Ireland?

Yes; in the Districts of Innis, and in Derry, and in the Districts of the County of Mayo.

And Tyrone?

Yes; and the South of Ireland, though I was not there.

From your Inquiries you have little Doubt that throughout Ireland there must be 2,000,000 or 3,000,000?

I have no Doubt whatever as to 2,000,000; but the Gentleman who has published a Work upon that particular Subject makes it more than 4,000,000; but I do not believe that there are so many.

Who is that Individual?

Mr. Christopher Anderson in Edinburgh, who has travelled through every Part of Ireland, and has published an interesting Volume upon that Subject, where he gives the Statistics of the Places.

Have you ever known, of your own Knowledge, or heard from Persons who did know of their own Knowledge, and on whose Account you can rely, any remarkable Proofs of their Proficiency when so taught?

I am very well acquainted with the Reports of the Irish Society, but I cannot speak to them from my own Knowledge; and I have often talked with Persons from those Parts who spoke in the most enthusiastic Terms of its Success.

You are acquainted with a Person of the Name of Conolan?

Quite well.

Have you seen the Books that he has published?

I have them all.

Do you believe that they have had any very considerable Circulation?

I do not believe that they have; he has not been able to put them into Circulation; nor do I believe that some of them are likely to get into Circulation to any considerable Extent.

The Irish Bible, of which there was a large Store in Dublin, you have inspected?

I have.

Do you think that that is intelligible to the People?

Most certainly it is.

Can you mention any Proof of its being intelligible, either from your own Knowledge or from what you have heard?

I have heard them read it,—Hundreds of them. I am acquainted with many in Glasgow that speak the Irish Language; some of them came to hear me preach the Gaelic. There are very gross Errors in it by Carelessness, and some Difficulties have arisen in the Correction of those Errors, and as we could not get those Corrections made in Ireland, the Bible Society at Edinburgh have resolved to publish a Volume in Ireland of the Irish Scriptures.

Did you ever hear them attempt to translate their Irish Bible into English?

Frequently. I have asked them to take the Irish Scriptures, and read Passages, and give me the Meaning of it in English, and I have been amazed at the Manner in which they have done it; though their English was very bad, it satisfied me that they understood it.

Was their English at all good?

No, not good.

But good enough to show that they understood it?
Thoroughly.

Did it seem to you that the Use of the Irish Bible by them repressed or encouraged their Attention to the English Language?
We have found in the Highlands of Scotland, and it has been ascertained there to be the Fact also, that if there was no higher Object to be gained by the teaching through the Medium of those vernacular Dialects than the Encouragement of the Knowledge the English and English Books, that it is the surest and quickest Way to introduce English.

You speak of teaching in the Highlands of Scotland; have you had Experience there?
I have been all my Life connected with Education Societies.

And in the Highlands of Scotland, where they speak a Language very similar to the Irish, have you had great Experience?
A great deal.

In those Parts of the Highlands of Scotland, is there a considerable Mixture of the Population of different Religious Persuasions?
There are only Two or Three Districts in the Highlands of Scotland where there is a Roman Catholic Population; there may be a few here and there accidentally, but there are only certain Districts where there are any Number of them.

In those Districts, are the Roman Catholics pretty numerous?
They are numerous.

Consisting of some Thousands in the same District?
There is one Parish where there may be upwards of 3,500.

In what County is that?
Inverness.

Have you any Notion of what the Proportion of Protestants is?
In that Parish there are very few Protestants.

Do you know of any Parish in which there is a mixed Population of Roman Catholics and Protestants?
In various Districts of the Parish of Arnamacher, including Arisaig, Maidart, Knaidart, and in the Districts stretching towards Lochaber and Glengary.

In what County?
Partly Argyle and partly Inverness.

In those Districts does the Parochial System of Schools prevail?
In every Parish there is one Parochial School; but in many Parishes some of the Inhabitants are, I suppose, nearly 100 Miles from the Parish Schools, or Sixty Miles. There are Schools in those Parishes called the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland Schools, and those Schools and the Parish Schools are all conducted on the same Principle.

What is that Principle?
The Principle is, a Portion of Scripture is read every Day in the School by what is called the Bible Class.

Is that the upper Class?
Yes; and the New Testament by some of the junior Classes, when they arrive at that; and then there are certain School Books that have been prepared for the different Schools.

In those Schools is there often a Mixture of Roman Catholics and Protestants?
There is occasionally; but I cannot say of many in proportion to the Number of the Schools.

Roman Catholics are in many of those Schools?
There are.

In the Schools in which the Scriptures are regularly read?
Yes.

Dr. M'Leod.

Are the Roman Catholics compelled to read the Scriptures?
The Instruction given by the Church of Scotland is, not to read it if the Parents object; they are by no means to be urged to read it; if the Parents do not object, to let the System go on without Notice; but on no account to ask the Children to read if the Parents show any Unwillingness.

Have you had personal Experience of what goes on in those Schools?
I have been deputed by the Church of Scotland to visit them all. In every one of the most distant Islands I have visited them.

Have you in consequence of that been acquainted with those Schools?
I know almost all the Teachers in the Islands.

Did you ever happen to know of any Instances of Roman Catholic Parents objecting to their Children not only being present at but reading in the Bible Class?
I have never heard of it.

Did you ever hear that such Things do occur?
Never.

Do the Priests object?
When I was proceeding to those Popish Districts I considered it my Duty to wait on the Roman Catholic Bishop in my Way to the Place, knowing that without his Concurrence we could do nothing, and really not wishing to adopt a System that might be disagreeable to him, and which of course he could destroy, if he was disposed, by his Influence. Principal Baird of Edinburgh and I called upon him in our Way to visit those Schools in the Western Islands and to establish new Schools, in order to make him aware of the whole Plan, and he seemed most favourable to all our Views, and gave us Letters of Introduction to the Priest, and the Priest waited on us when we arrived at Barra, and offered us every Assistance in his Power. Some Time after that, that Priest was removed and another Priest appointed, who ordered the Children to leave the School if the Scriptures were used; but the Bishop deposed him, and sent him off the Island, and ordered the Children to go and receive the Blessings of Education, to enable them to go to the Low Country and procure Places, and to get on in the World.

What Island was that?
Barra. I see that the School is vacant at present, owing to the peculiar State in which the Island is at this Moment.

Did that second Priest, who objected to the System, come from Ireland?
I really do not know, but I know that the Priests of late Years in the Islands are passing to and fro very frequently to Ireland.

But you have no Reason to think that that Priest did come from Ireland?
No.

Was this the only Time that you have had Occasion to see the Roman Catholic Bishop in the Highlands?
I have passed a Night with him. I was well acquainted with him.

Is he alive now?
He is not; he has died some Years.

Do you know what the Practice of his Successor is?
I understand that the same Liberality, as to Education, is shown by him; and I know this as a Fact, that there is a Deposit of Gaelic Bibles and Testaments in the Houses of influential Roman Catholic Gentlemen in the very Place where the Bishop and Priest had the greatest Influence, and that they are circulated and issued to the People.

Where is that?
In the District of Arisaig.

What is the Edition of the Bible used in those Schools?
It is the Authorized Version of the Church of Scotland, we call it; there is no other.

Dr. M'Leod.

Does that materially differ from the Authorized Version of the Church of England?
Not at all.

It is the same, with the Exception that the Apocrypha does not appear?
It is the Translation from the Authorized Version of the Church of England into Gaelic.

Do you happen to know whether there are any particular Exceptions made as to Passages of the Scriptures that the Roman Catholic Bishops or Priests are unwilling that the Children should read?
They made no Remarks to us of the Kind.

Have you any Reason to suppose that they ever expressed an Opinion that any Part was less fit to be so read than another?
No; they have no Version in the Gaelic different from ours.

And they showed no Indisposition for any Part or the Whole to be so read?
No, I never heard of any.

You stated that the Old Testament was not put into the Hands of the younger Children, but that the New Testament was; will you explain more particularly what Portion of Scripture is put into the Hands of the younger Children?
We consider that the Children can read the New Testament, which is more simple and more intelligible than the Old Testament, and they begin with the Beginning of the Gospels, and go through.

Was the Instruction confined to reading the Scriptures simply, or was any Examination entered into of their Principles and Doctrines?
There are regular Days of Examination of the Catechism of our Church; the Forenoon is devoted, in all Schools, to Examination on Religious Subjects.

Are the Roman Catholic Children present on those Examinations?
I never heard of their going away, but I know that there are Schools where the Catholic Children do not join in the Exercises of the Catechism; but they are not of our Schools.

The Question refers to the Instruction derived from the Bible?
It is not consistent with my own Knowledge.

Are there any Instances in which the Roman Catholics do join with the others in learning the Catechism of the Church of Scotland?
I cannot say, but I never heard that they did not; we have given minute Instructions to our Teachers not to interfere at all.

It is the Principle of the Church of Scotland not to press the reading of the Scriptures upon any Children whose Parents would object to it?
Decidedly.

You never in fact have heard of either Roman Catholic Parents or Priests objecting to the reading of the Scriptures?
No.

If they did object of course that Scruple would be attended to?
Yes.

If you found that the Roman Catholic Priesthood or the Parents objected to the Use of the Scriptures, would you so far acquiesce in those Wishes as to make it necessary that the Scriptures should be used?
We could not consider any School as under our Superintendence where the Scriptures are not used; but we have one Parish where they are all Roman Catholics.

In the Schools where the Scriptures are read is there after the Lesson is done, or while the Lesson is going on, any thing like Explanation of the Meaning of the Words?
A regular Explanation.

Dr. M'Leod.

On every Day of the Week?
The Children, as they read the Gaelic, are asked to give the Meaning of the Passages they read in English; and while they are reading it in English they are desired to give the Meaning of it in Gaelic, so as to see that they understand it.

Is there ever any Explanation given to them beyond the mere reading of the Words?
A regular System of intellectual teaching.

It is not merely having the Scripture read, but having Explanation of what is read?
Regular Explanation. All our Teachers now must attend the Normal Schools, where they learn the System.

Are those Teachers principally Licentiates or Probationers?
We take none that are Licentiates or Probationers.

Are you now speaking of the Parochial Schools?
No; of the General Assembly Schools; there are a few Licentiates in the Parochial Schools, but of late Years there has been a great Desire to obtain Persons for those Schools who will confine themselves to that.

What Books are used in those Classes which are not sufficiently advanced for the Scripture Lessons?
There are several Books which were prepared at the Sessional School of Edinburgh by Mr. Wood; some of those have been translated into Gaelic, at the Request of the Church. There are Collections for the more advanced Children in Gaelic, translated by me, of Articles, Moral and Religious, and Historical and Natural History, just as they have in English Schools. These have been translated for their Use into the Gaelic, and are used in all their Schools, to a certain Extent.

When you saw the System of Education which you have been speaking of in Galway, you must have been struck with the great Difference between what you witnessed there and what you have witnessed in the Highlands of Scotland?
I was.

Did you make any Remark upon the Subject as to the Reason of that great Difference between the Two Countries?
I conversed with every body I could get to converse upon the Subject, urging upon them the Necessity of teaching them in their own Language.

Did you think that was One Cause of the Difference?
Yes; and I found that the great Objection made was, that it would retard the Progress of the English; that was the Idea taken up. They seemed to wish to let the Gaelic Language alone, and die; that has been the System of the last many Hundred Years, and the Irish is as much alive as ever.

That applies only to Galway and the Districts where the Irish Language is spoken by the lower Classes?
Yes.

You consider the System of Education in Scotland still very deficient for the Wants of the Population?
Very deficient; we have 83,000 in the Highlands and Islands who can neither read nor write.

Do you consider that though there is a Want of sufficient Instruction in Scotland the System itself is very deficient?
The System has been deficient, but the utmost Attention is now paid to training proper Teachers, and no Man is appointed to a School who has not a Diploma from the Normal Schools in Edinburgh or in Glasgow, and they are examined by Committees upon the different Branches.

What is the Salary given to the Masters?
£25 is the utmost and 20*l.* the lowest, and some Fees also from the Children, besides a House and small Garden.

You are speaking of the General Assembly Schools?
Yes.

What Species of Examination do the Persons who come from the Normal Schools go through to obtain their Diplomas?
They attend the Normal Schools generally Three Months. They are examined before they are sent into the Normal Schools to know what the Extent of their Knowledge is, and they are sent to the Normal Schools merely to learn the Art of teaching; but before they go to the Normal Schools they are examined by Committees of the General Assembly and Sub-Committees upon their Knowledge of the Gaelic Language, upon the reading of the English, upon English Grammar, and the ordinary Branches of Arithmetic.

Are they examined as to their Knowledge of the Scriptures?
Most minutely; there is a Sub-Committee for that Purpose for examining into their Religious Knowledge.

They are not sent to Normal Schools until they have what you deem a sufficient Knowledge of Scripture?
Each Sub-Committee enter in a Book their Opinion of the Qualification of the Individual upon that Branch; then the General Committee meet and consult, and send him to the Normal School.

Are they in ordinary Cases Members of the Church of Scotland?
We could not find any speaking the Gaelic Language who are not; there are no Dissenters in the Highlands of Scotland.

Except Roman Catholics?
There are very few in the Highlands of Scotland that are not Members of the Church of Scotland; that is, few of those educated that are not. Education is only of Yesterday in the Catholic Districts.

But there are a considerable Number of Roman Catholics?
Yes; but there are none that could be qualified for that Situation.

Are there any Number of Episcopalians?
No, not many.

Would you take an Episcopalian?
I am quite sure we would, if qualified; but I am not aware that any has offered.

Are you acquainted with the Schools for the Poor in the Town of Glasgow?
Yes, I am.

Are there a great many Irish Roman Catholics in them?
Yes.

Do you find that those Roman Catholics in Glasgow equally well attend the Schools as in those other Parts of Scotland of which you are speaking?
There are Catholic Schools, as they are called, in Glasgow, supported by Contributions of the Inhabitants at large.

Do you know the System carried on in those Schools?
The Scriptures are read there.

Invariably?
Invariably.

Have you ever heard of any Objection being made on the Part of the Priesthood to that System?
It is a distinct Arrangement made between the Roman Catholic Clergy in Glasgow and the Managers of the Schools. "If you allow the Scriptures to be read at certain Hours we will patronize the Schools, and find Funds; and we will leave the Religious Instruction to yourselves, only that you read the Scriptures." English and Arithmetic is taught at other Hours.

What Version of the Scriptures do they read there?
The Authorized Version.

Dr. M'Leod.

The Authorized Scotch Version?
The Authorized English or Scotch Version, I believe.

There would be no Objection to the Use of the Douay there, if it was required by the Priesthood?
I do not know that the Point was ever mooted.

But invariably the Children have the Use of the Scriptures?
I know that they have, for I am Secretary to the Bible Society from which they receive Grants.

Are the Roman Catholic Clergy of Glasgow under the Superintendence of a Roman Catholic Bishop?
Yes; there is a Roman Catholic Bishop in Glasgow.

So that this Arrangement must be known to him?
Decidedly.

And you never heard of any Objection whatever being made on his Part?
No.

Did you ever hear of any Objection being expressed?
The Schools are under his immediate Patronage and under his immediate Superintendence.

Under his immediate Superintendence this reading of the Scriptures in the Authorized Version regularly takes place?
Yes; upon that Condition the Subscriptions are made.

Who appoints the Masters?
The Bishop and his Clergy solely.

Have you any Reason to believe that there are any Roman Catholic Schools in Glasgow for Children, and that the Parents object to their Children attending those Schools?
I have never heard it.

Did you ever hear that mentioned, that Roman Catholic Children did object in point of fact to those Schools?
No, I have not.

Do you believe that there are any Instances of the Parents of the Children so objecting; as the Clergy and Bishop do not object, is it not unlikely that there would be any Objection offered by the Parents?
The Parents leave it with the Bishop and the Clergy.

Are there any Schools in Glasgow supported exclusively by Roman Catholics?
No, not exclusively, so far as I know; the Catholics are poor.

The Catholics in Glasgow are Sons of Irish Catholics who came over for Work?
Almost all.

Is the Bishop an Irishman?
A Scotchman; and the Priests are almost all Scotch.

Do you know the Name of the Bishop?
I forget his Name at present.

Do you happen to know whether there is any Union or Communication between the Roman Catholic Bishops in Scotland and those in Ireland?
I have no Access to that.

What Care is taken in the General Assembly as to ascertaining the Moral Character of the Teachers before they are appointed?
They are obliged to produce Certificates from the Clergymen of the Parishes from which they come, and very particular Inquiry is made as to their Moral Character in the Districts where they live; and they are generally examined by the local Presbyteries before they come to Edinburgh for Examination, having Certificates from their Parish Minister and from the local Presbytery.

Dr. M'Leod.

There is in fact rigid Inquiry made and close Attention paid to the Moral Character of the Teachers who are admitted into those Schools?

We do not appoint a Man whom we do not believe to be decidedly religious; we may be deceived at the Time, but that is the Principle upon which we act.

Have you any System of Inspection after the Appointment?

The Schools are annually visited by some Members of the Committee or by the Secretary, and there are Reports made. Every Presbytery in the Highlands examines them at least once a Year, and the Reports of those Examinations are transmitted to Edinburgh, and every Parochial Minister is obliged to examine them at least once in the course of the Year, and to report to the Presbytery; and the Report by the Presbytery contains the different Examinations by the different Members of the Presbytery.

Then the Parochial Clergy are very much employed in the Inspection of those Schools?

Yes; we have a Committee of the General Assembly for receiving and classifying the Reports of Examinations of Schools over the whole Country.

That includes the Parochial Schools?

Yes.

And the Parochial Clergy feel bound to examine as well into the Proficiency of the Scholars as into the Character of the Teachers?

Yes.

What are the precise Terms of the Arrangements with respect to the Schools at Glasgow; that the Scriptures are to be read at the Schools?

Yes. I am not above a Year Minister in Glasgow, so that I cannot precisely give so distinct Evidence as I would wish; but I shall know soon, as I am likely to be One of the Managers of those Schools.

Do you know whether any different Arrangement with respect to the Appointment of the Schoolmasters was ever made with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Glasgow?

No; for he would never give up the Point of appointing them.

You do not know to what Extent the Scriptures are read in the Schools, or at what Time?

I cannot say I know the Fact.

At Glasgow there is no joint Education of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children?

No, none that I know of.

But the Condition of assisting Roman Catholic Schools is, that there shall be bonâ fide the reading of the Bible in them?

Yes. The Circumstance that makes me know that the Roman Catholic Bishop has the entire Appointment of the Teachers in the Catholic Schools is that I heard it stated in the Report.

And they are removeable at his Pleasure?

Entirely.

How long were you in Ireland in August 1833?

I have been frequently in the North of Ireland.

Since?

Yes, and before it.

What was the longest Stay that you made in Ireland?

I was Six Weeks there.

Did you see only those Schools in Ireland which you have mentioned?

No, for I found that Irish was not taught in those Schools, and therefore I had no Desire to see them.

When you went to meet the Synod of Ulster in Dublin did you not go to any of the Schools in Dublin?

No.

Dr. M'Leod.

Your Object was to prosecute Inquiries as to the Introduction of the English Language, and not to know the peculiar Character of those Schools?

No; my Object was to know the peculiar Character of the Irish Language.

In the Catechisms which were used in the General Assembly's Schools at the teaching of which you said the Roman Catholics were often present, is there any Matter peculiarly offensive to Roman Catholics?

Of course a great Part of the Catechism must be offensive to them, but I am not prepared to say that Roman Catholics do learn our Catechism.

But they are present when it is taught?

Yes, they are.

The Doctrine would be contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome?

Decidedly; it is the Westminster Catechism.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Jovis, 16° *Martii* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Reverend JAMES GRAHAM is called in, and examined as follows:

Have you any Pastoral Charge in Ireland?
I am Curate of the Parish of Templemore in the County of Derry.

Have you had much Knowledge of Education in that Country?
I have been very much interested in the Subject of Education since I have been in Orders, and I have had Opportunities of seeing the School, particularly in Parishes where I was the Clergyman.

You are connected with the Kildare Place Society, are you not?
I have held the Situation of Clerical Secretary of that Society, which I may say I have resigned: on the 1st of April my Connexion with that Society will cease.

Have those Circumstances given you an Insight into the Subject of Education?
Yes, they have, more than would otherwise have been the Case.

How many Years were you connected with the Kildare Place Society?
Four Years.

Have you taken any ardent Part in opposition to the Board of National Education in Ireland?
I have been so impressed with the great Importance of the Question that I have examined very much into the Principles of the National Board of Education in Ireland, and I have felt it my Duty as a Clergyman to avail myself of Opportunities of making Statements which I thought would rather tend to remove the favourable Impressions which some People had towards the National Board.

You have taken a Part by going about to different Parts of the Country, have you not?
Not in Ireland; I have in England.

Have you gone about in England for the sake of creating Prejudice against the Board, or for what Purpose?
Certainly not for the Purpose of creating Prejudice against the Board. My sole Object in coming to England was this: the Kildare Place Society, feeling itself deprived of its accustomed Parliamentary Grant, and having been all along in a great measure a Society supported by voluntary Contributions, wished to preserve its Position as far as it could. Having been well received throughout the Country, when the Funds drawn from the Parliamentary Grant were thus removed, my principal Object was to preach Charity Sermons, and to visit and address Associations wherever they might be formed in different Parts of the Country for the Purpose of supporting the Schools of that Society.

In Ireland have you gone much about to public Meetings opposing the Board?
I am not aware that I ever attended a public Meeting in Ireland on that Subject.

Have you had Occasion to observe in your Part of Ireland that the Board have been endeavouring to establish Schools in Parts where they have not appeared to be required for the Purpose of Education?
In the Parish in which I was the Curate for about Three Years, the Parish of

Rev. J. Graham.

Errigal in the County of Londonderry, there were some Schools introduced for which I think there was no Occasion, and certainly without the Sanction of the Clergyman of the Parish.

When you say without the Sanction of the Clergyman of the Parish, you are aware that they were not obliged to have his Sanction?
I am aware of that.

Did they not apply for his Opinion whether they should have one or not?
There was a Change of Clergymen about the Time of the Institution of the National Board in the Parish of Errigal, and the present Rector was, I believe, the Rector of the Parish when one of those Schools was established under the National Board. I now speak of Two Schools, one in the Parish of Errigal, and one in the Parish of Desertoghill; they are adjoining Parishes.

They were not under the same Clergyman?
No.

What was the Name of the Clergyman?
The Reverend Mitchell Smyth.

When the School was established in Errigal, do you know whether the Clergyman was consulted beforehand on the Subject of its Establishment?
I know he was not consulted.

How do you know that?
He wrote to me to say that he had not been consulted; that the School was instituted in the Parish without his Sanction or his Knowledge, I think, as far as I remember his Letter, of which I am in Possession.

Have you his Letter about you?
I have.

What is the Date of it?
January 30th, 1836.

Will you read that Part which relates to the School?
The whole Letter relates to the Schools:—"My dear Mr. Graham,—In reply to your Letter respecting Lisnascreagh School I have merely to state that it was placed under the National Board without either my Sanction or even Knowledge, and that no Communication, before or since, has been made to me on the Subject." That is the whole which is material.

By looking at the Report of the Board, this School is given as in the First Class of Applications, namely, on the Application of the Protestant Clergyman and the Roman Catholic; it is the Reverend G. V. Sampson; do you know him?
He is a Clergyman of the Established Church.

Is he the Curate there?
He is not.

Is he Rector or Curate of any contiguous Parish?
He is not a Rector or Curate in any Parish of the Diocese.

How do you know that?
As far as I can be acquainted with the Fact without having seen Documents; I know the Clergy of the Diocese; I live in it; and I know he is not a Clergyman of the Diocese.

Your Father is a Rector in the Diocese?
He is a Rector of the Parish of Tamlaghtard.

Has Mr. Sampson any Property in the Parish?
I never heard that he had, and I believe that he has not.

How far from the Parish does he live?
I believe he is now a beneficed Clergyman in the Neighbourhood of Dublin.

At the Time that Application was made?
He lived at a Place called Walworth, between Newton Limevaddy and Londonderry; about Twelve Miles from it.

Was

127

Rev. J. Graham.

Was he not living upon his own Property?
He was living in a House he rented at Walworth, I think, from one of the Irish Societies, the Fishmongers Company.

At what Period was this?
I think he resided at Walworth; his Father had resided in the Parish before, and he had been the Curate of the Parish of Errigal up to his Father's Death.

In what Year did his Father leave?
He died, I think, in the Year 1827.

Had he no Lease of the House in which he lived?
I cannot say whether he had a Lease of the House; I understood he had a Lease under the Fishmongers Company.

How long had he been Curate of Errigal?
I cannot say how long he had been Curate of Errigal; his Father had been Rector of the Parish, and he had been Curate. I was unacquainted with the Parish until I became Curate, and that must have been in the Year 1829, but did not come to it immediately.

From the Year 1829, when you became Curate of Errigal, this Gentleman had no pastoral Connexion with the Parish?
He had not from the Year 1827.

He was resident during the whole of that Time Twelve Miles off?
His accustomed Residence, when he was in the Country, was Walworth, Twelve Miles from Garvagh, the Town situated in the Parish of Errigal.

Were you acquainted with Mr. Sampson?
Very slightly; we conversed when we met.

Did you ever see him at his House at Walworth?
I never saw him at Walworth, but he held a Farm in the Parish of Errigal to which he came occasionally, and I have seen him in the Parish of Errigal, when he came to that House, perhaps twice a Year.

Did he rent the Farm, or was it his own?
He rented the Farm during Part of the Time I was Curate.

You were asked whether he had Property in the Parish, and you said he had not?
I did not consider that to be Property; I meant to say he was not a Landed Proprietor.

You understood the Question to refer to his own Freehold?
Yes.

He had Leasehold Property?
I am not aware whether he had a Lease of it, but for Seven Years he held that House and Farm.

Of how many Acres does that Farm consist?
It was a House and Domain of Mrs. Arthur Heyland, but he was not a Resident in the Parish. There were, I believe, about Twenty-five Acres of Land.

Did he often go there?
Very seldom.

Do you know whether when he came he regularly visited the School?
I should say that he came very seldom, and sometimes when he came he did not visit the Schools.

By "very seldom" can you give any Notion what you mean; how often in the Year?
Perhaps twice a Year.

He did not always visit the Schools?
No.

Rev. J. Graham.

What Means have you of knowing that he did not come oftener than twice a Year, you having Business of your own to attend to, and other Matters than watching the Visits of Mr. Sampson?

I never watched the Visits of Mr. Sampson. The Grounds I rented joined his Grounds, and in a small Community and in small Towns we almost know every one who comes to it; I do not mean to say I knew every Time he came, but I am quite safe in saying he came once or twice a Year, and only thereabouts.

You say he came once or twice a Year, when he did not visit the School; did he ever visit the Schools?

He sometimes visited the School; I judge from the Minute in the Books of the School.

How often have you seen in those Books that he visited?

I could not say how often, but I should say very seldom, perhaps once or twice a Year.

You have been in the habit of seeing the School and examining its Books?

Not since it became a School under the National Board of Education, but I had seen it before.

You have not been there since it has been under the National Board of Education?

I have not.

You have had no Means of ascertaining whether Mr. Sampson has visited it since it became a National Board School?

I have not seen the Books of the School, but I have been occasionally in the Parish, and I know he has been living for the last Three or Four Years as he lived before, Ten or Twelve Miles from the Parish.

You said you knew he did not visit the School often by examining the School Books, and now you say you have not visited the School since it became a School under the National Board of Education; you have not, therefore, examined the Books since it became a School under the National Board of Education?

Of the Lisnascreagh School I have not; but there are other Schools.

Have you then any Means of knowing whether Mr. Sampson has visited the School since it has been put under the Board of National Education?

Not whether he has visited that particular School, I have not.

When was this School placed under the National Board?

Shortly after the Institution of the National Board; I cannot point out the Date.

When was it you saw by the Books that Mr. Sampson had so seldom visited it?

I was Curate of that Parish from late in 1829 for about Three Years or Three Years and a Half, and in speaking of the Books of that School now I have made Reference to it as a School instituted by Mr. Sampson before the Existence of the National Board; that is the Period in which I speak of his Visits to the School. I was asked whether Mr. Sampson had resided much in the Parish from 1827; and it was more with reference to his Residence in the Parish, or his occasional coming to it then and up to the Time the Board was established, than to his Visits to the Schools subsequently, that I spoke.

This School had been established by Mr. Sampson, he being then Curate of the Parish before it had been under the Protection of the National Board?

He was not at the Time it became a National School Curate of the Parish; Mr. Sampson had been Curate of the Parish, and as Curate, I believe, he was instrumental in establishing the School; but in putting it under the National Board, and in visiting the School under the National Board, he was not Curate.

Mr. Sampson being Curate of the Parish before the Institution of the National Board, was not he instrumental in establishing that School?

He was.

Rev. J. Graham.

How long had he been resident Curate of that Parish?

I cannot say how long; perhaps Three or Four Years; I cannot say that that Space is correct; his Father had been Rector.

Do not you think that Mr. Sampson being for Three or Four Years, as you state, Curate of the Parish, and resident in the Parish, he had some tolerable Means of forming a Judgment as to the Necessity of having a School established there?

Certainly; he had the same Opportunity that any resident Clergyman would have.

Do you consider that the Establishment of that School at the Time Mr. Sampson established it was an unnecessary or an improper Act?

I think it was neither unnecessary nor improper if it has Reference to the first Establishment of the School.

Why do you consider now that the Protection of that School by the National Board, or the taking it under their Management, has been an unnecessary or an improper Act?

I should desire to state my Reply to that at some considerable Length, if I am permitted. The District in which that School is situated is very peculiarly circumstanced; it is exclusively a Roman Catholic District, and I have Reason to believe that the Inhabitants of that District were enabled to obtain an Education for their Children which brought them to a Knowledge of the Scriptures; and it is the common Opinion of the People, we hear from every one in that Neighbourhood, that until that School was established the People had no such Opportunity. I think the Effect of the Transfer of that School to the National Board of Education, in the course of Years, will be to deprive the Neighbourhood of the Advantage they have of obtaining a Knowledge of the Scriptures.

Your Reason for considering that the Adoption of that School by the National Board was improper is, that it tended to deprive the Scholars of the Benefit they before had of a Knowledge of the Scriptures?

I think its Tendency in the course of some Years will be that.

What was the Knowledge of the Scriptures the Catholic Inhabitants of that Parish had when it was first established?

I do not know when it was first established, but when I went to that Parish I have sometimes visited that School, and I found that the Children in that School, who were as I understood nearly all Roman Catholics, read the authorized Version of the New Testament. I speak from Memory of what occurred some Years ago.

Do you mean that they read it from Beginning to End as a School Book?

I cannot say whether they read it from Beginning to End, but I have examined them in it, and I have heard them read it, and asked them historical Questions, and Questions bearing substantially on the Portions they read, and I have found them in many Instances well acquainted with the Book.

Are you acquainted with the Scripture Extracts now read in the Schools under the National Board?

I think I could scarcely say I have read them all through, but I am very generally acquainted with them; I think I have read Three Numbers of them through.

Will you take upon yourself to say that when the School was established in the first instance, when you say they had the Benefit of scriptural Education, they had the Means and did get a more complete Knowledge of the Scriptures than they do now, supposing the Scripture Extracts to be read amongst them?

Supposing the Scripture Extracts to be read amongst them, they would, in a different Way, obtain the Knowledge of Things contained in the Bible, I admit; but my Answer is, that the Tendency of this School, in the course of a few Years, would be to deprive them of the Opportunity of knowing the Scriptures. I think, in the Lapse of Time, that the Tendency will be to deprive them even of the Extracts. I do not speak of that School only; I think it true of a great many.

Rev. J. Graham.

Do you consider the Extracts as sufficient as the whole Scriptures?
By no means.

You say you have read only Three Numbers of those Scripture Extracts; do you know how many Numbers there are?
I am in Possession, I think, of them; I believe there are Four.

Do you not believe that those Scripture Extracts purport to give to the Persons who read them a Knowledge of the historical Parts of the Old Testament as well as the New?
Yes; the Statement of the Plan of the Extracts in the Preface leads one to suppose that.

Does the reading the Extracts, so far as you have gone, lead you to believe that the Statement in the Preface is untrue?
Not the Statement, as to purporting to give a Knowledge of historical Facts.

Have you any other Reason for saying that the Establishment of this School in Errigal was unnecessary and improper than that the whole System of the Board is unnecessary and improper?
When I look at the Tendency of the Schools I have seen elsewhere and the Tendency of the Schools of the National Board, I think it both, and fear that the Effect of the Schools will be bad.

You have already said that you consider the Adoption of this School, and the taking it under the Protection of the National Board, was an unnecessary and improper Act; have you any other Reason for saying that than because you think, generally speaking, the whole System of the National Board was unnecessary and improper?
I have several other Reasons for saying it that I have stated, besides this general Reason.

As it respects that particular School?
First the System of the Board, then the Interference in the Parish on the Part of a Clergyman having no Connexion with it as a Clergyman.

One of your Reasons for thinking it unnecessary and improper was, that Mr. Sampson, who previously had been the Curate of the Parish, having ceased to be the Curate, he interfered in the Recommendation of this School?
Yes; and another Reason is, that I do not think there were Grounds for believing that the People wished it.

Has the School been attended since it was adopted by the National Board?
I have known very little of it; I have not gone into it.

You cannot tell whether it works well?
I have no Reason to think that the Attendance has diminished.

What is your Reason for believing the People had no Wish to have it put under the Board?
Because they were so willing to have their Children instructed in the Scriptures before; they were pleased with the Advantages of the School.

Did any Protestant Children attend the School before?
I think there are no Protestants in Glenullin, the District in which it is situate; the School is called Lisnascreagh.

There are no Protestant Children at all in the District?
I think not.

With respect to the Scripture Extracts, you have read Three Numbers?
I have seen all the Numbers, and have read Three of them.

Have you read those Numbers attentively?
I have read them through, but I do not mean to say I have read them all with a critical Eye; there are some Things which arrested my Attention very powerfully, and I examined them.

Favourably or unfavourably?
I must confess that my Impressions were unfavourable.

Why

Rev. J. Graham.

Why were they unfavourable?
I objected to the Notes, and I objected to the Manner in which those Passages of Scripture were dealt with, independently of the Notes and Translations, which I always objected to.

Did it appear to you, from the Perusal you gave to those Three Volumes, that they presented a fair Exposition of Scripture, so far as they professed to exhibit Scripture to the Scholars?
I did not think they did.

This Gentleman you say had ceased to live in the Parish for some Years when you went as Curate there?
Yes.

During that Time were you frequently in the habit of attending the School?
I was not frequently; I very seldom went to the School; it was a School in a Roman Catholic District, and under the Care, or permitted at least, as I understood, by the Roman Catholic Priest of the Parish, who never had expressed any Dislike to the School, and I declined interfering with it.

Did that Delicacy prevent your visiting it?
Yes.

You were connected with the Kildare Place Society?
No, not at that Time; but I was Curate of the Parish.

Do you know whether at that Time Mr. Sampson, living Twelve Miles off, was in the habit of coming frequently to inspect the School?
He was very seldom in the habit of coming, and it was to that Time my former Statement referred.

You are convinced, you being wholly resident in the Parish, that he was rarely in the habit of coming to that School?
I asked the Teachers at the Time, (he received the Gratuities from the Society under which the School was placed, and paid the Teachers of that School and several other Schools,) and I know very well from them that he was not in the habit of coming frequently; he was considered as coming once or twice a Year.

That you had from the Teachers?
Yes; from seeing the Register kept in the School, and from the Teachers.

Did you go and look at the Register occasionally?
I did visit the Schools and see it occasionally.

You saw from the Inspection of the Register that at that Time Mr. Sampson was rarely there?
I cannot say whether he did not sometimes make an Entry in the Register, but there were few Entries.

How often may you have gone to this School to examine the Register?
I cannot say how often I visited the School.

You abstained from going frequently out of Delicacy to the Person who had the Management of it, you say?
I did; I consider that the School was working exceedingly well; it was a very pleasing Circumstance that a Roman Catholic Priest in a Parish should allow a School of that Nature in his Parish, and I considered it under his Eye, though Mr. Sampson was the Patron.

From what did you judge it was working well?
When I went into the School I generally saw a large Scripture Class, but I went very seldom.

When did you go into the Parish of Errigal?
I was appointed Curate the latter End of 1829; I did not go there immediately, and I left in 1833; I was there about Three Years.

How often did you visit the School during the Time you were Curate of the Parish?
I cannot undertake to say how often I visited it, but I visited very seldom; I very seldom made an Entry in the Book.

Rev. J. Graham.

Did you ever make an Entry in the Book?
I think I did.

You are not quite sure whether you ever made an Entry in the Book?
I think I did once at least.

You are quite confident Mr. Sampson visited it very rarely?
Mr. Sampson was Patron of several Schools; I think he visited that School very seldom; I cannot undertake to swear that he visited it very seldom, but I believe that was the Fact.

Have you the Means of knowing?
Yes, the Means I have stated; the Teacher and the Book.

You have no other Means?
It is a very small Community; no Stranger comes to the Place without its being observed particularly, especially those who have been known there before.

Had not that School been under the Kildare Place Society at first?
Yes.

Did you, when you were Secretary of the Society under which it was placed, take an Opportunity of visiting it?
I was not at that Time Secretary of the Kildare Place Society; the Office I hold under that Society was connected with Duties in England, not in Ireland; it was not under the Kildare Place Society while I was Secretary of that Society.

Did you, or not, while you were Curate of the Parish, often visit the School?
I did not visit it often.

You abstained from Delicacy, it being a Roman Catholic School, and thinking that the Priests would be better satisfied?
My Object was not so much that they personally should be better pleased, but I thought that more Good would be done by my not attending.

Do you know that the Scriptures were read in that School regularly?
I do. I found the People I met were well pleased when I visited the School; but the Circumstance of its being under the Roman Catholic Priest, and Mr. Sampson's Connexion with it, prevented my going so often as I would, because I did not wish to have it appear that there was any Disagreement between the Clergymen of the Established Church or unnecessary Collision with the Roman Catholic about Schools. We felt very painfully about that School all along in some respects.

When you went there did you occasionally find a Class reading the Scriptures?
I understood the School to be conducted under the Plan of the Kildare Place Society with the Scriptures.

You were understood to say, that when you went visiting the School you often or generally found some Class or other reading the Scriptures?
I either found them or called them up to read.

Have you called them up to read?
I have.

Have you found them read as if they were in the habit of reading the Scriptures?
They read very intelligently.

Did they appear to have a good general Knowledge of the Scriptures?
There were some very intelligent Youths in the Class, and some that were not; I could not say, except in One or Two Cases, that they had a very good Knowledge of the Scriptures.

From your Experience in Schools, should you say that those Children gave an Impression that they had been well taught in the Scriptures?
Quite as good a Proportion in that Class, according to my Impression, as in any School of the Kind elsewhere.

Did

Rev. J. Graham.

Did they appear to you to have a Knowledge of the Scriptures superior to that they might have got from reading the Scripture Extracts, if they had been used in the School?

I scarcely know how to answer that Question; if I had taken a Chapter, a Part of which has been removed in the Extracts, and given it into a Child's Hand, the Child might read it for a very long Time without learning from that Chapter in the same Way as he would out of the New Testament.

Do you think that the Children who you say appeared to you to have a Knowledge of the Scriptures had a better Knowledge of the Scriptures than they could have had from reading the Scripture Extracts with which you are acquainted?

I have some Difficulty in answering that Question, because they would not have the whole of the Scriptures, and therefore could not learn from the Extracts Parts they perhaps know. I have no Doubt that from reading the Extracts they might learn more of the Scriptures than most of the Children whom I examined knew, because in that Class many of the Children had not attained such a Knowledge of any Part of the Scriptures as might be attained even through the Extracts. If they read the whole of the Scriptures they would learn more than from the Extracts, but I think it would be possible to teach the Children more from the Scripture Extracts than many had learned in that particular Class.

You have said the Children you saw in the School appeared to you to have a Knowledge of the Scriptures?

They did.

Was the Knowledge of the Scriptures they appeared to you to have greater than they might have had from reading the Scripture Extracts if they read them through, and were properly instructed in them?

I think it would be possible to teach them a greater Number of Facts from the Scripture Extracts than they had learned.

You say you are not quite sure that you made an Entry in the Books when you visited those Schools?

I rather think I made One Entry.

You frequently visited those Schools?

No; I visited that School very seldom.

You have not stated that you have frequently examined this upper Class in the Scriptures; is it not usual for the Master on such Occasions always to ask you to make an Entry in the Book?

The Master sometimes asks, and sometimes does not.

Is it not required by the Regulations of the Kildare Place System that all Visitors shall make an Entry?

They wish it.

Was it not the Rule of that Society while you were Secretary that Visitors should make that Entry?

It is the Desire and the Rule of the Society that it should be proposed to Visitors, but Visitors do not always make an Entry.

When you visited those Schools and examined the Children in the Scriptures, which you say you did frequently, you are not sure that you entered your Name?

I know that I visited when I did not enter my Name; I am not sure that I entered my Name more than once.

Then you did not comply with the known Rule of the Society by the Course you took when you inspected the School?

I did not.

Is the Schoolmaster of the School under the Kildare Place Society the same who now continues under the new Board?

I believe it is the same Master.

He is a Roman Catholic?

He is.

Rev. J. Graham.

Had you ever a Conversation with the Priest before it became a School under the Board on the Subject of this School?

I am very slightly acquainted with him, and seldom conversed with him or his Curate, but I never conversed with them upon that Subject.

You state that at the Time you visited or sometimes abstained from visiting this School you felt painfully with respect to it; will you explain what you mean by that Term?

I was the Curate of the Parish, and myself and the Rector who preceded the present Rector felt that we were very much interfered with by the Circumstance of Mr. Sampson having been the Patron of that School, and in that way we did not know well how to deal with the School. It was Matter of Delicacy towards Mr. Sampson, and my Feeling in the Parish was, on the one hand, to interest myself in the School, and, on the other, not to interfere with Mr. Sampson; therefore it was very awkward.

In what Way did that Feeling operate unfavourably to yourself?

I feared lest an unpleasant Impression should arise in the Minds of the People, unless great Care and Caution were observed.

You have just said that the Scripture Extracts were objectionable to you because you thought they did not give a fair Representation of the Scriptures; can you call to your Memory any particular Passages which you believe do not give a fair Representation of the Scriptures?

I can.

Do you remember the Book to which that applies?

The First Number of the Old Testament; the Passage I refer to is in the New Testament, though it is in that Book; it is in the Fortieth Page. There is a Passage taken from the Seventh Chapter of the Book of Hebrews:—"Now consider how great this Man was, unto whom even the Patriarch Abraham gave the Tenth of the Spoils. And verily they that are of the Sons of Levi, who receive the Office of the Priesthood, have a Commandment to take Tithes of the People, according to the Law, that is of their Brethren, though they come out of the Loins of Abraham. But he whose Descent is not counted from them received Tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the Promises, and without all Contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And inasmuch as not without an Oath he was made Priest (for those Priests were made without an Oath, but this with an Oath, by him that said unto him, The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedec,) by so much was Jesus made a Surety of a better Testament." I object to that Passage.

Why?

Because, if I am correct, there is a very considerable Omission in the Passage; it reads as a continuous Passage, and it is apparently an unbroken Chain of Argument.

In what Manner is that introduced?

As a Note or Comment of St. Paul on the History of Melchisedec.

Does it not appear as a Note?

It says, "The Apostle Paul thus comments upon this Narrative in Hebrews 5th and 7th." Here we are introduced to St. Paul's Comment upon that.

In what respect do you consider that an unfaithful Exposition?

The Passage reads as a continuous Passage; it appears here as an unbroken Chain of Argument, and as if no Omission had been made, but I think Twelve Verses are omitted. "And without all Contradiction the less is blessed of the better." "And inasmuch as it is not without an Oath." Now between the Words "better" and "And inasmuch" I believe those Twelve Verses come in in the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the omitted Parts between the Words I have pointed out, the Words "better" and "And," consist of the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th Verses.

Will you read those Verses?

"And here Men that die receive Tithes, but there he receiveth them of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And, as I may so say, Levi also who receiveth Tithes paid Tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the Loins of his Father when Melchisedec

Rev. J. Graham.

Melchisedec met him. If therefore Perfection were by the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the People received the Law), what further need was there that another Priest should rise after the Order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the Order of Aaron? For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a Change also of the Law. For He of whom these Things are spoken pertaineth to another Tribe, of which no Man gave Attendance at the Altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which Tribe Moses spake nothing concerning Priesthood. And it is yet far more evident, for that after the Similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another Priest, who is made not after the Law of a carnal Commandment, but after the Power of endless Life. For he testifieth thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedec. For there is verily a disannulling of the Commandment going before for the Weakness and Unprofitableness thereof. For the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better Hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God."

What is the Argument you consider to have been omitted there which is lost to the Scriptural Knowledge of those who learn?

I think the Argument omitted there is the Abolition of a sacrificing Priesthood.

Has that in your Judgment any special Reference to any Controversy between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Church?

It has.

State what that is?

I think the Effect of at least One Verse in this Chapter which is omitted on the Minds of Roman Catholic Children would be such as would not be desired by the Roman Catholic Priesthood.

Which is that Verse?

The 12th Verse.

Have the goodness to read it?

"For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a Change also of the Law."

Do you really think that Children of that Age, with the Acquirements of those of which you speak, are capable of entering into a Question of that Kind?

I think they are in a great measure, in consequence of the catechetical Instruction they receive as Roman Catholics.

Do you think the Children you examined in that Class you state you examined would be capable of understanding such Points?

I question very much whether they would understand the bearing of the Argument, but I am quite convinced, though I did not examine them on that, that they have been taught (I mean the Roman Catholic Children) in their own Catechism the Sacrifice of the Mass; but if I understand the Question originally put to me in reply to which I bring forward this Passage, it was on what Ground I object to the Book of Extracts; now, I should say, I here object first on the Ground of the Omission, but I think the other Ground is very important.

Do you think, that whether the Children are capable of following this Argument or not, it is important that it should rest in their Minds till the Time when they may become capable of understanding that which is in this Passage respecting a non-sacrificing Priesthood?

If I understand the Question rightly, I think the Effect of these Books is likely to be as great upon the adult Population as on Children; and that an Impression going abroad in the Minds of Roman Catholics which they could not well reconcile with Statements of the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass in their Catechism, a Statement especially such as this, concerning a Change of Priesthood, would, in the Case of Persons of very limited Minds, and of such circumscribed Information as the Roman Catholic Peasantry on the Subject of the Scriptures, have a very strong Tendency to create Inquiry; it would meet their Prejudices in a Way that I think would be unfavourable to the Views of the Roman Catholic Priesthood on that Subject.

Rev. J. Graham.

What was the Scope of the Argument for which the Extract was introduced?
I believe there is no Argument intended. These are Extracts from the History of Melchisedec. The Compiler of the Extracts says, after having introduced those Extracts respecting Melchisedec, "The Apostle Paul thus comments upon this Narrative, Hebrews 5. and 7." My great Objection to the Passage is not altogether so much to any Point intended by introducing the Comment as to the Fact that the Book professes to give the Comment, but does not give it.

Do you object to this, that it pretends to be a Quotation, and is not a whole Quotation of the Passage it pretends to quote; or is your Objection that it omits some Passages which, if left to operate on the Minds of the Roman Catholic Peasantry, might produce an Effect unfavourable to the Roman Catholic Religion?
I object to it upon the first Ground.

Do you object to it on the other Ground, that it is likely to produce an Impression unfavourable to the Roman Catholic Religion?
I think that is more a Matter of Probability than Certainty, but because it is even possible it is one of my Objections.

Have you any further Objection?
I am not aware of any other Objection to the Passage at this Moment.

Read the Heading of that Note?
"The Apostle Paul thus comments on this Narrative in Hebrews 5. and 7."

Is your Objection this, in short, that that Book, stating they are going to give the Comments of St. Paul on a certain Passage, omits what you consider an important Part of St. Paul's Comment?
Yes.

Does the Passage profess to give the entire Comment of the Apostle?
It says he thus comments; the Word "thus" I decidedly understood to include the whole Comment.

The Passage being given as one continuous Argument, without stating the Number that the several Verses bear, does not show that there are Verses omitted?
Not only without stating that, but the Part succeeding that which is omitted proceeds with the Word "and" as if it followed the Words immediately before, as in the original Chapter.

That Word "and" begins a new Paragraph, does it not?
It does, but there is no Mark of the Omission of an important intervening Paragraph between it and the preceding.

You have put in a Letter from a Protestant Clergyman, which appears to be an Answer to a Letter from yourself?
It was.

How came you to address him on the Subject of this School at Errigal?
I wished to obtain Information upon the Subject of the Institution of Schools in every Place as Occasion offered.

You wrote to him to ask him whether he was applied to?
Yes.

What led to your addressing him on that Subject?
I was in constant Communication with Persons in every Part of England on the Subject of the Schools, and it was necessary to be informed accurately.

(*The Bishop of Exeter.*) Did the Bishop of Exeter ask you to apply to that Gentleman?
I think that it was in some measure in reference to an Inquiry of your Lordship; the Impression upon my Mind is, that you did ask me about that School, but I could not say positively that it was.

Rev. J. Graham.

You were not asked whether the Rector had been consulted?
I distinctly recollect having had a Communication with his Lordship upon the Subject, but whether he asked me to get him the Information or not I cannot say.

Have you the Correspondence which took place with the Bishop of Exeter here?
I am not in Possession of it here; it is in Ireland.

In whose Possession is it?
I believe it is in my own House, locked up.

Have you ever read the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Douay Version?
I have not read it all in that Version, I believe.

Do you happen to know whether the Verses omitted in the Extract are omitted in the Douay Version?
No; I am not aware of any Omissions in the Douay Version.

Does the Douay Version ever omit any Verses?
I believe not.

Are you well schooled in the Douay Version?
No, I am not well skilled in it.

Was there any other School in the Parish of Errigal belonging to the Board?
There has been, and I believe there is, a School near it; the School of Magheramore.

In what Parish is that?
It is in the Parish of Desertoghill.

How long is it since your Connexion with the Parish of Errigal ceased?
In April 1833, that is as Curate; but my House has been in it since.

You have no clerical Connexion there?
My House is there, and I have lived there when at home till within the last Two Months, when I went to be Curate in Derry.

Since that you have been Agent to the Kildare Place Society in England?
Yes.

What Agency had the Kildare Place Society to do in England?
I was appointed by them to come to England to Places where it was likely local Associations would be formed as a Medium of procuring Subscriptions for their Schools, and to preach Charity Sermons for the Society.

You came to raise Subscriptions for the Kildare Place Society?
I did.

You said in the early Part of your Examination that you had taken Steps to remove the favourable Opinion some People had of the System of Education established by the National Board in Ireland; what Steps are those you have taken for that Purpose?
In the Opportunities I have of addressing public Meetings and of preaching I have compared the existing Systems of Education in Ireland, and stated my own Opinions upon them; and those Opinions of mine have been unfavourable generally to the System and Management of the National Schools in Ireland, and favourable to the other.

You preached these Sermons and made these Statements at public Meetings in your Character of Agent for the Kildare Place Society?
I did.

In attempting to set up your Society, you endeavoured to cry down the other?
No, I do not like to put it in that Way.

You considered that as a Rival to your Society?
Rival in Principle only; if the System of National Education in Ireland were at all approaching any System likely to extend the Knowledge of the Scriptures,

Rev. J. Graham.

tures, I would not cry it down; on the contrary, I would feel it an imperative Duty to promote it.

Are you acquainted with many of the National Schools in Ireland?
Very little, comparatively speaking.

Do you know what the Principle of Education is in the National Schools?
I have seen their Book of Rules and Regulations, and some of the Schools that have been in operation.

Are you aware that the resident Minister, if he chooses it, may call out a Class and instruct them in the Scriptures on particular Days?
I am.

Are you aware that the School is not imperatively called together on that Day, but that they may come if they please?
It is not compulsory.

It is not compulsory in the same Manner as it is on the other Days; there is no Roll kept; it is quite in the Pleasure of the Children whether they come or not?
Yes; according to the Rules and Regulations of the Board, as I have seen them printed.

Have you seen not merely the Rules and Regulations, but the Constitution of the Board; probably you have seen Lord Stanley's Letter?
I have read Lord Stanley's Letter.

Is it upon that in part you form your unfavourable Opinion of the System of the Board?
Yes; there is one Statement in that Letter particularly to which I would refer.

What is that Statement?
It is that the reading of the Scriptures is the vital Defect of the pre-existing Systems in Ireland.

Have the goodness to point out the Passage?
"The Determination to enforce in all their Schools the reading of the Holy Scriptures without Note or Comment was undoubtedly taken with the purest Motives, with the Wish at once to connect religious with moral and literary Education, and at the same Time not to run the Risk of wounding the peculiar Feelings of any Sect by catechetical Instruction or Comments which might tend to Subjects of polemical Controversy. But it seems to have been overlooked that the Principles of the Roman Catholic Church (to which in any System intended for general Diffusion throughout Ireland the Bulk of the Pupils must necessarily belong) were totally at variance with this Principle; and that the indiscriminate reading of the Holy Scriptures without Note or Comment, by Children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a Church which denies even to Adults the Right of unaided private Interpretation of the sacred Volume with respect to Articles of Religious Belief." That is one Passage of the Letter which, as it bore on the Principles of the National Board, led me to object to the Principle of the National Board; it states that the indiscriminate Use of the Scriptures is obnoxious to the Church of Rome. Now, that Principle is rejected; but a Principle the opposite of it, and equally obnoxious to the Protestant Churches, is, as I understand it, embodied into the System of the Board.

Have the goodness to read the next Sentence?
"Shortly after its Institution, although the Society prospered and extended its Operations under the fostering Care of the Legislature, this vital Defect began to be noticed, and the Roman Catholic Clergy began to exert themselves with Energy and Success against a System to which they were on Principle opposed."

Does that form Part of your Objection?
It does.

Have

Rev. J. Graham.

Have you read the Declaration of the Kildare Place Society when it was first instituted?

I do not myself recollect the Institution of that Society, but I believe it was instituted in 1812, from my Knowledge of its Reports.

Have you any Reason to know whether, when it was first established, it was not opposed by the Protestant Clergy as being on too liberal a Footing?

Yes; I know from the Protestant Clergy many of them were averse to it; there was a Difference of Opinion.

Do you know when their Opposition began to relax; was not it after the Roman Catholic Body had made Objections to it that the Opposition to it on the Part of the Protestant Clergy began to abate?

It may be in point of Time.

Do you believe that to be the Fact?

I believe it to be so, but I do not believe that to be the Cause why the Protestant Clergy took it up; I think the Cause of the Protestant Clergy taking it up was that they saw it was doing good, prospering in the Country, and extending its Schools.

Was not there a very strong Opposition on the Part of the Protestant Clergy of Ireland to the Progress of that Society?

There was.

Were there not also some public Bodies very much opposed it?

I am not aware to what Bodies Allusion is made.

Your Father is a Clergyman in the North of Ireland?

Yes.

Was not your Father the Grand Chaplain of the Orange Society?

He was.

You must have communicated with your Father a good deal upon these Subjects?

I have communicated very little with him upon these Subjects, considering the Relation of Father and Son.

No Part of your Objection to that Board was on the Footing on which it has been put by the Resolutions of the Orange Institution?

My Objections to it are totally distinct from any political Objection whatever, purely religious. If the Principles of this Board were such as I thought would extend the Knowledge of the Scriptures in the Country, and promote Morality, I would give it Support, whatever the Source from which it came. If I thought it calculated to do Good in the Neighbourhood in which I reside, or elsewhere, by its Schools, where Scriptural Instruction was given before, I should most certainly support it.

Do you not believe that if those Extracts from the Scriptures were generally read, and the Children instructed in the Passages contained in those Selections, a greater Number of Children in the Country would have a better Knowledge of Scripture than they had before the Establishment of those Schools?

I do not.

Are you aware that a large Body of the Clergy in the Diocese to which you belong are anxious to have this System modified so as to make it acceptable to Persons of all Religious Persuasions?

I am aware of that.

Are you aware that they have had Meetings for that Purpose?

I am.

Have you attended those Meetings?

I have not attended any of those Meetings.

Have you subscribed the Petition on this Subject to Parliament?

I have not.

Rev. J. Graham.

On neither Side?
No.

What was your Reason?
I should object to both of the Petitions.

On what Ground?
I should object to sign the Petitions on these Grounds;—one Petition came from some of the Clergy of the Diocese who were anxious to bring about a Co-operation with the National Board upon Principles that I did not agree with, therefore I did not sign their Petition; the other Petition came from a Body of Clergymen in the Diocese who objected not only to those Petitioners Views and to the proposed Co-operation with the Board, but who also objected generally, I believe, to the Principle of seeking Assistance from Government for Schools on the Principles of the Established Church, because they thought, if they got a certain Grant of Government for Schools in connexion with the Established Church, the adopting those Principles would deprive the Roman Catholic Children of receiving Scriptural Instruction, inasmuch as it would give them over necessarily to Schools of an opposite Character, for the Roman Catholic Priesthood would then apply for Schools on their own Church Principles; but I could not see an Impropriety on the Part of a Clergyman in applying to Government for Assistance to Schools on the Principles of his own Church. I signed neither Petition; I did not apprehend that such Consequences would necessarily follow. Those were my Reasons; there was another Reason which influenced me in some measure, which is this: I was connected as Secretary with the Kildare Place Society, and I had contemplated, although I had not heard of it, the Probability of a Petition from that Society, and therefore I determined at all events to delay signing any Petition until I should be in Dublin, as I was very soon; that was a Reason which influenced me in some little measure, but my decided Reason for not signing either Petition was the other, although I believe I have never stated these Reasons so explicitly before.

Did you hope that the Government Grant might be again transferred to the Kildare Place Society?
I cannot say that I did hope that, but I wished to know the Views of the Committee before I signed any Petition in Derry that might counteract their Opinion. I cannot say that I had any such Hope. The great Object is to produce some System in Ireland that will circulate the Scriptures and promote Morality; I think, therefore, it is not a Question between Societies or Institutions, but a Question affecting the Country. I hesitated as to signing any Petition, because the Kildare Place Society might take some Step; but certainly if I had found that one of the Derry Petitions stated my Views, having ascertained that there was no Petition from the Kildare Place Society, I would have signed it. It was possible both Petitions might have proposed new Arrangements equally desirable: I should have wished to choose, and, if possible, to give my Signature to what I considered best.

You said that in Desertoghill there is a School; what is the Name of that?
Magheramore.

Have you any particular Remarks to make about that School?
It was placed under the new Board without the Sanction of the Rector of the Parish, and it was thereby changed from being a School under the Kildare Place Society without his Sanction.

Who is the Rector?
The Rector of Desertoghill is the Reverend William Smith.

How do you know that the Reverend Mr. Smith never gave his Sanction?
He informed me by Letter; I wrote to him to ask him; I was aware of the Fact before.

Did Mr. Sampson join also in the Application for that School?
Yes; he is the Applicant for that School also, I believe.

Rev. J. Graham.

Is that a contiguous Parish to the other?
It adjoins the other.

How far is that from Mr. Sampson's Residence at Walworth?
The Distance of Magheramore School from his Residence is, I apprehend to be, about Nine or Ten Miles.

Your Feeling is this: you are of opinion the whole Scriptures without Note or Comment ought to be put into the Hands of all Persons, whatever their Age may be?
It is; I do not feel that we have a Right to withhold any Part of the Scriptures.

Have you ever examined into this Subject; do you happen to know what the Doctrine of the primitive Christian Church was upon that Subject?
I am quite of that Opinion upon my own Views from reading the Scriptures.

Have you at all examined what was the Doctrine of the earlier Reformers of England upon that Subject, and the Reformers generally?
I think the Principle of the Reformers was to disseminate the Scriptures.

Was the Principle of the early Reformers to put the entire Scriptures, without Note or Comment, into the Hands of young Persons?
They accompanied it by Catechisms.

Have you ever examined into that Subject?
I have read a great deal upon the Subject, but I have not prepared myself for this Line of Examination.

Did you ever happen to look into the Opinions of Bishop Burnet upon that Subject?
I have; I am acquainted with Bishop Burnet's Views in his Exposition of the Sixth Article of the Church of England.

Are you acquainted with his Opinions as to the Propriety of putting the entire Scriptures, without Note or Comment, into the Hands of young Persons?
I cannot undertake to state his Views upon that Subject in express Words.

Are you at all acquainted with the Views of Dr. Burnet, who was, perhaps, a more learned Man than Bishop Burnet, upon that Subject?
No.

You say it is from reading the Scriptures you have formed your Opinion that it is a Duty to put the Scriptures, without Note or Comment, into the Hands of young Persons?
Partly from that, and partly from seeing the Good that results, but chiefly and primarily from reading the Scriptures.

What have you found in the Scriptures upon that Subject; they could not express an Opinion as to the Distribution of the Scriptures, unless it is the Distribution of the Old Testament?
I think the Commands of the Old Testament are borne out by the New; I think the Command to teach the Commandments diligently to the Children applies.

You say you cannot state what was the Opinion of the early Christians upon the Duty of putting the whole Scriptures into the Hands of Children; you are not competent to state the Opinions of the old Reformers upon the Subject, or the Opinions of Bishop Burnet, or the Opinions of Dr. Burnet, but that you speak from your View of the Scriptures themselves?
I can give a Statement of what I conceive their Opinion to be, but I cannot give a Statement of their Opinion in their own Words.

The Decision you have come to is, that you found the Necessity of having the entire Scriptures, without Note or Comment, put into the Hands of Children on the Scripture itself?
Primarily I have collected that Opinion from reading the Scriptures, but I do not say there are not other Sources from which I have been confirmed in that Opinion.

Rev. J. Graham.

Do the Scriptures contain any Injunction as to the Scriptures themselves being put into the Hands of Children?

I think there is a Command to teach Children the Scriptures of the Old Testament, decidedly.

The Question refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and so on?

I should say, with respect to the Book of Revelations, there is a Blessing pronounced on the reading of it.

State any Passage from which you think it is to be inferred that the entire Scriptures, without Note or Comment, should be put into the Hands of Children?

I do not think there is any isolated Passage that would alone lead to that; I think the great Strength of Scripture lies not in detached Passages, but in the mutual Elucidation of the several Parts of it as they bear upon each other when you can bring them together without Delay from the whole Bible.

Was it not the Opinion of the early Reformers that the entire Scriptures ought not to be put into the Hands of Children, but that they should have some Degree of Instruction, particularly previous Information, before they were fit for the reading of the Holy Scriptures; was not that the Opinion of the principal Reformers of the Church?

I believe it was.

Do you hold an Opinion contrary to theirs?

I should say, with respect to the early Reformers, that there were a great many Remnants of the objectionable Principles of the Church of Rome which remained among them.

You do not conceive Bishop Burnet to have been a Person holding the Errors of the Church of Rome?

No, quite otherwise; but I do not class him with the early Reformers.

Are you a Clergyman of the Church of England?

I am.

You are of course conversant with the Canons of the Church?

I have read the Canons.

Do you as a Clergyman assent to the Canons?

Yes.

Are you aware of the Provision of the 79th Canon?

I do not know the Contents of it by the Number.

It is enjoining on Schoolmasters to teach Extracts from the Scriptures?

I distinctly recollect that Canon.

Do you object to that?

I do not say that I object to Extracts, I never did that, but that we have no Right to withhold the whole Scriptures from Persons willing to have them.

You do not mean to infer from that that it was improper in those Schools established under the Board to teach Extracts?

By no means; I do not think there is an Objection to Extracts, but that there is an Objection to Extracts accompanied by a Rule which removes directly or indirectly the Book from which the Extracts are taken.

What was the Reason for your Preference for the Kildare Place Society's School at Lisnacreagh to the School under the National Board?

I preferred it for these Reasons;—the Scriptures were used before in the School; the Tendency of the present System is, as far as I can judge of it, to prevent the Continuance of the Use of the Scriptures; that was the first Objection I have formed.

Were not Extracts from the Scriptures, as well as the Scriptures themselves, allowed in the Kildare Place Society?

They were; but I do not wish to be understood as speaking of the Kildare Place Society's System as in all respects in itself alone a perfect System of Christian

Christian Education; I do not believe it ever professed to be such; I believe it to have been serviceable to a great Extent in the Country as laying a good Foundation for sound Christian Instruction. *Rev. J. Graham.*

Do you not know that the Kildare Place Society made use of Extracts as well as the entire Scriptures?
They did.

Consequently they were on the National Plan as it regarded the Use of Extracts, but were superior as having beyond that the Use of the Scriptures?
I think that they were superior in both. I object to the Extracts of the National Board as not being fair.

Do you understand that the Children in the Schools on this System of Education under the National Board still have the Advantage of a complete Scriptural Education?
I do not understand that they still have the Advantage of a complete Scriptural Education.

They give Opportunities to the Clergy of every Denomination to instruct the Pupils in the Schools in their Religious Faith, independently of the School Instruction?
Yes; and I think a great Objection to the System in point of Provision for Discipline and other internal Arrangements is, that as it is constructed a School might by possibility be conducted without, as I take it, the Use of any Book at all; not only without the Use of the Bible, but any Book. They seem to carry the Principle of Non-compulsion much too far, so much so that if I were a Roman Catholic Priest, and preferred oral Instruction, as I believe many of them would, to any other, I think I might have a School under the Board without violating any express Rule of the Board, and yet without using any Books. The Board might object at present, but its Members may change, and I think they could not show now that this would palpably infringe upon the Letter of any positive Rule. I certainly imagine it to be quite within the Limits of Possibility to comply with all their Rules, as well those for the combined moral and literary as those for the separate religious Instruction.

Have you not Reason to know that those Scripture Extracts are very generally used in the Schools?
I have seen them in the Schools; I believe they are generally in the Schools.

Do you not believe they are generally used in the Schools?
I cannot say how far they are used; I know there are Schools where they are used.

Do you, or not, know that those Scripture Extracts are very generally used in the Schools both by Protestants and by Catholics?
I have Reason to believe that they are more used than they have been. It was stated to me by one of the Commissioners that the Board, as to the Instructions by Clergymen, say nothing about Books, and I applied this to the whole System, as I think it applies.

Did you ever hear of a single Instance in which an Attempt has been made to carry on the Schools without Books or Extracts?
No; nor should I have taken up the Idea, but from a Letter from a Commissioner, which led me to consider the whole of the Regulations very minutely.

And upon that Foundation you raise your Objection against this System of the joint Education of Protestants and Catholics?
My great Object in raising this Objection is, that the Use of the Bible, if the System continues, may not by any Possibility be lost.

What was the Statement in the Letter of the Commissioner which led you to that Inference?
I have a Copy in London of the Letter sent to me, either the Original or a Copy.

Rev. J. Graham.

Can you produce the Letter?
I think I have a Copy of the Correspondence.

What was the particular Passage which led you to infer that the System of oral Instruction might be carried on without Books?
I can produce it if I have it here; I have not looked into the Letter for a considerable Time, but I have, I believe, a Copy of the Correspondence in London with me.

The Expression in the Letter you say produced an extraordinary Effect upon your Mind, and led you to believe that which you could not otherwise have believed, that such a System was possible?
The Idea arose in my Mind from reading the Letter, and comparing the Statement with the whole of the Regulations of the Board.

What was the Expression which led you to believe that?
I cannot state it literally, but I can give the Effect of it. I think it is, "We do not say that any Books at all are to be used." I could not swear to that as being literal, but I swear to it as the Sense.

Do you not know that they do not require the Use of any Scripture Extracts in those Schools?
I do.

Do you consider it as a valid Objection to this System that in its Principles it does not require so much as the Use of a single Book?
I do consider it a valid Objection to its Principles.

From what Commissioner was the Letter received?
The Reverend James Carlile. I had some Correspondence with him upon the Subject of the Principles of the Board of Education.

What is the Rule of the Kildare Place Society that requires the reading of the Scriptures every Day in the Schools?
They require that every Child who can intelligently read shall read the Scriptures.

How much is required to be read?
I do not think they require any definite Portion.

A Chapter?
A Chapter might be read, or more or less.

How little would satisfy the Rule; would One Verse?
I do not think One Verse would satisfy the Society.

Would One Verse satisfy the Rule?
I should consider One Verse an Evasion of the Rule.

Would it not satisfy the literal Direction of the Rule?
Perhaps it would, but I think, inasmuch as it would, the Rule is capable of Improvement, because not sufficiently explicit.

Would they not be satisfied with a Certificate from the Master that the Scriptures had been read in the School?
I think they would not; they usually gave a Gratuity according to the Progress of the Scholars, and I think it would appear, upon the annual Inspection, that it was not done.

How would that appear?
By the Examination of the Children and the Examination of the Master.

That would not show how much was read each Day?
It would not show the specific Quantity for specific Days; but if only a small Quantity were read each Day, on the Inspector's Visit, though only once a Year, it would be very easy to ascertain whether One Verse or One Chapter a Day had been read.

Is it the Principle that the reading of the Scriptures is required by the Kildare Place System that makes you prefer that System to that of the National Board?

That

1115

Rev. J. Graham

That would be a Part of my Ground of Preference; I cannot say that it is the Whole; I am influenced in favour of the Kildare Place Society by that, certainly.

Is that the only Ground of Preference you have, or not?
There are negative Grounds; it does not produce objectionable Extracts; it does not produce Rules and Regulations that appear to me objectionable.

You have stated that you are at present employed in England in order to promote the Objects of the Kildare Place Society?
I can hardly call that my Employment now; I was so employed, but my Engagements with the Society are ceasing now.

Were you so employed when you came to this Country?
Yes, when I first came over; but this Time I have been in England only about a Fortnight or Three Weeks.

By whom were you employed?
By the Committee of the Kildare Place Society.

Did you receive any Instructions when you undertook this Duty?
I did.

From whom did you receive those Instructions?
From the Committee of the Kildare Place Society.

Did those Instructions contain an Injunction to state your Disapprobation of the National System, as well as to promote the Objects of the Kildare Place Society?
I think not; I do not think there was any Injunction. I have not read the Instructions lately.

Were they written Instructions?
They were.

By whom are they signed?
I think they are signed by Mr. Serjeant Jackson and Mr. Rutherfoord.

Are you in Possession of them?
I think they are in Derry, but I can get a Copy of them by Return of Post from Dublin.

Were your Services gratuitous, or do you receive a Gratuity?
I receive a Salary from the Society.

Are you Secretary to the Society?
The Designation of my Office is Clerical Secretary.

In pursuance of those Instructions, have you declared your Disapprobation of the National System of Education from the Pulpit?
Not in pursuance of my Instructions. I was given to understand those Instructions were very much Matter of Form; they were kind enough to leave a great deal to my Discretion; they confided the Cause to me.

Have you, since you have been in England, declared your Disapprobation of the National System of Education from the Pulpit in Sermons?
Yes.

And in consequence of that you considered that you were exercising your own Discretion, in pursuance of the general Instruction which you had received from the Kildare Place Society?
Not in pursuance of any Instructions I had received. I should have objected to have the Views pointed out to me which I was to propound from the Pulpit.

Would you have thought yourself justified in your Discourses to pursue any Course that was not in conformity to the Instructions you had received?
The Instructions did not bear upon the Arguments. They said they appointed me to the Office of Travelling Secretary, as they then expressed it; it was afterwards changed to "Clerical Secretary." They requested me to write to them from different Places, but I do not think they instructed me as

Rev. J. Graham.

to what I should say on any Subject in the Pulpit. I could not have assented to such Instructions.

Was preaching in reference to the Society itself Part of the Instructions you received?

I do not think they instructed me or commanded me to preach; but their Object was, if it was found desirable in any Place I visited that a Charity Sermon should be preached on behalf of the Schools, I should preach such Charity Sermon, but they never pointed out to me the Line of Argument I was to adopt.

Did you receive any Suggestion whatever or Instruction to preach against the National Board?

I have no Recollection that I ever did.

Have you preached against the National Board?

I do not think I can state that I have ever preached with the sole View of opposing the National Board, but I have preached against its Principles; I have objected to its Principles in preaching, certainly.

Your Father, you say, is the Rector of Tamlaght Ard; did you see any thing of the National Schools in that Parish?

I saw very little of them; I know there are Two in the Parish.

Do you know any thing about them?

Yes; I was not long since in that Parish for a Day or so, and I saw the Ballymaclary School.

What is the State of that School?

It is a School of a very inferior Description as to the Apartment, fitting up, and Arrangements.

How is the School-house?

The House is very bad; the Room is small; the whole House consists of a Room of small Size; the Windows are out of repair; the Fire is in the Middle of the Room on a raised Pile of Stones, and there is something like a Basket above to let the Smoke out; it is a very poor House.

The Sum Total of the Scholars on the Roll, as given in this Return, is 118; supposing they are all there, can the Master with Convenience carry on the Business of the School; what sized Room is it as compared with this?

Probably about One Third of the Size of this Room.

Do you think it would have been possible to have carried on the School Business with tolerable Regularity and Usefulness if the whole Number of those Children had been present?

We are accustomed to very crowded Schools, therefore we do not consider that so much; but I should think it very inconvenient.

With the Sort of Accommodation this Room afforded, with the Fire in the Middle, could the School have been profitably carried on with the Instruction of the Children in Classes?

The Classification would be very difficult indeed; I think with 118 Children very great Inconvenience must arise.

Do you think they could have stood in it?

I think they could have sat or stood very closely packed together; Children occupy a very small Space sometimes.

What Sort of Light was there in the Room?

I think there was very tolerable Light; not very good.

This School is returned in the First Class of Application; a Presbyterian Clergyman and Two Roman Catholic Clergymen are returned as the Applicants for it; do you know any thing of the Presbyterian Clergyman?

Mr. Porter is, I think, the Presbyterian Clergyman mentioned in the Board's Return as having received Money for the School.

Is he mentioned as their Correspondent?

He is mentioned as having received Money as Applicant for a School in the Year 1835. I have not seen the List of 1836.

Does

Rev. J. Graham.

Does Mr. Porter live in the Parish?
He does not.

You are well acquainted with the Parish, being your Father's Parish?
Yes, I am occasionally there; I have been very little in it; I resided in it for Five or Six Months in the Year 1827 as licensed Curate.

Is there a large Population of Presbyterians there?
I believe that the Population of the Church of England and the Presbyterians both together is little more than 1,000, and perhaps Two Thirds of them are Presbyterians. I have not looked lately what the Amount of the Population is in the authorized Returns.

Is Mr. Porter the Presbyterian Clergyman in that Parish?
He is not; the Congregations of Presbyterian Ministers are not limited by Parishes, but he is not the Presbyterian Minister of that Place.

Who is?
Mr. Buller is the Presbyterian Minister of that Place.

Do you know why Mr. Porter is concerned for that School if he has not any Connexion as a Minister with the Place?
I should think because it was thought desirable by those who established the School to have the Appearance of a Protestant Minister's Name to the Application; and Mr. Buller, the Presbyterian Minister of the Place, has, I have Reason to believe, been opposed to the National System of Education.

You surmise that as the Reason; you do not know that?
I cannot conceive any other Reason; I do not positively state that to be the Reason.

Are you in the habit of attending that School yourself?
No.

Have you ever been in the School when the Children have been there?
I have.

You think Mr. Porter's Name was introduced for the Purpose of practising a Deception?
I did not say Deception; it would be very hard to say that; but the Presbyterian Minister of the Place I understand to be opposed to the National System of Education. This is a Gentleman living in another Place at some Distance, having no Connexion with the Parish that I am aware of; having neither Property, Relations, nor Hearers, as far as I ever heard.

Do you think that was calculated to mislead the Public upon the Subject?
I think indeed it was.

And intended for that Purpose?
I cannot swear to Intentions; I can only say I cannot think of any other Reason than that I have stated.

You stated it was felt desirable that there should be a Presbyterian Minister, and therefore they applied to them?
The Impression upon my Mind is that they applied for that Reason; but, as I stated before, I cannot swear to Intentions.

Do you know Mr. Buller?
I do.

Have you had a Conversation with him on the Subject of the National Board?
I think I have had many Conversations with him upon the Subject of Education generally, and certainly some bearing upon the Subject of the National Board of Education.

From your Conversations with him touching the National Board, are you satisfied that he is opposed to it?
My decided Opinion, without being able to quote the precise Words, is, that he is opposed to the National Board.

Rev. J. Graham.

Do you mean, by your Reference to the Basket at the Top of the School, to say that the Recommendation given by the Patrons of the School was not correct?

I do not mean to say that.

Is there any Chimney in the School?

That is the Chimney.

As Secretary to the Kildare Place Society, had you any Opportunity of comparing the Nature of the Returns with the Number of Scholars under their Instruction?

I have seen the Returns.

Do you consider those Returns to have been correct?

I certainly have no personal Knowledge of them.

From the Opportunities you have had of judging of them, do you believe them to have been correct?

My Duties of Secretary did not lead me to a Knowledge of that Fact.

Had you any Opportunity of forming any Opinion at all upon the Correctness of the Returns of the Number of Scholars?

I cannot say that I had, because my Duties of Secretary did not refer to the Office Business of the Society. I take up their Reports as your Lordships or any other Person would, and I depend upon the Integrity of those Reports.

Have you any Reason to know whether they have been in the habit of including in the Returns all the Children who have ever been in the habit of attending, without making Allowances for those who have ceased to attend?

All that I can state from my own Experience in the Parishes where I have been Curate or resident is, that the Children who have not been in attendance the last Half Year have been struck off the Roll.

Did any of the Returns you saw of the Number of those in attendance include all those which had been struck off the Roll?

I think they did not.

Will you refer to the Appendix to the Third Report, Page 62; you will see there a List marked No. 5.; will you read the Heading of that List?

"A List of Clergymen of the Established Church who have signed Applications to the Commissioners of Education for Aid that has been granted up to the present Time, noting the Persons who have died, and those who have signified their Desire to withdraw their Signatures, as referred to in Section III. of this Report."

If you will look down the first Column of that Page you will see "Graham, J., Ditto, Tamlaghtard, Tyrone;" who is designated by that?

I understand my Father to be the Person.

"Ditto" means Rector. Your Father is Rector of Tamlaghtard?

Yes.

Your Father then is stated to be an Applicant to the Board for Schools?

If I understand this right; but the County of Tyrone is introduced; it should be Derry. I believe there is no Tamlaghtard in the County of Derry, nor am I aware that there is any other beneficed Clergyman of the Name of John Graham, so that I believe he is the Person intended by that, and he has written to me to complain of his Name being introduced as an Applicant to the Board.

Does he deny having been an Applicant to the Board?

He does.

Have you got his Letter?

I have.

What is the Date of the Letter?

March the 8th, 1837.

Read

Rev. J. Graham.

Read that Portion of it in which he denies his having been an Applicant to the Board?

It is the very first Sentence in the Letter:—"I lose no Time in letting you know that a fraudulent Use has been made of my Name to the National Board of Education, or by them, for in the Newspapers I got on Saturday my Name appears among the Clergymen who applied to them for Assistance for Schools. I need not tell you I never did so, and that my Name must have been forged."

Is that all referring to that Subject?

There is more in the Letter referring to that Subject.

Have you any Objection to state it?

I have an Objection to reading it, but if it is thought important I will read it.

Does it relate to the Use of his Name as an Applicant?

Not the whole Letter, but there is something further referring to this Subject.

Will you read that which refers to the same Subject?

"I need not tell you I never did so, and that my Name must have been forged; and I request you will call on my respected Friend, the Son of an old and dear Friend, Dr. Gifford, of the Standard or St. James's Chronicle, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, and have the Calumny contradicted, as I shall take care to contradict it here."

Did your Father take any Steps to inform the Board of his Name having been used without his Authority?

I cannot say; I received this Letter only Yesterday.

Do you know whether he took any Steps to inform the Board that his Name had been used by them without his Authority?

I can form no Belief on the Subject; he says he intends to contradict it, but he does not say how; he says, "I shall take care to contradict it here," but he does not say in what Form or to whom.

Is this the only Intimation you ever had from your Father respecting it?

I received that Letter from my Father Yesterday with another; they had been waiting for me; they came under Franks, and were sent by the Twopenny Post. This is the first, which I have read; there is some Reference to it in the other Letter, but it is a Repetition; I am not quite sure which was written first, but I received them both together; I read this as containing the longer Statement.

In the List of the Protestant Clergymen who are stated to have signed Applications there is the Name of Blakeley, Theos, Rector of Deserttegney, Donegal; do you know whether he resides at Deserttegney or not?

He is not resident, I believe; whether he is there at this Time I cannot say, but he is not considered as resident there.

Brownlow, Francis, Rector of Upper Cumber, Tyrone; is he resident?

He is.

There is Colthurst, John, Rector of Termonamongan, Tyrone; is he Rector of Termonamongan now?

I believe he is promoted to the Living of Bovevagh.

Do you know that?

I know it in the way a Clergyman must know of the Transactions in his neighbouring Parish; I have not seen Evidence of it in the Diocese and Registry Office.

How long has he been removed from Termonamongan?

I could not undertake to say, but I think more than a Year.

There is Hamilton, Richard, Rector, Culdaff and Cloncha, Donegal; do you know him?

I do.

Is he resident?

He is not.

Rev. J. Graham.

Where does he reside generally?
I have understood he resides in Chester.

From whom have you understood that?
I think he told me himself; whether he has resided there constantly or not I cannot tell, but he once told me himself he was living at Chester.

Is he Rector of this Parish?
He is Rector of Culdaff and Cloncha.

Did he tell you he had not signed this Application?
I never had any Communication with reference to this Application; he may have resided in many different Places, for any thing I know.

He is not resident upon his own Living?
I have understood he was not; I was Curate of the next Parish, and know he kept a Curate because he was away.

Has he a Glebe House there?
I cannot say; I have no Means of knowing, although I have been in his House; but I cannot say whether it is a Glebe House or not.

You stated that you were not particularly attached to the Kildare Place System of Education; what do you consider to be erroneous in that System of Education?
I think it is deficient, inasmuch as it falls short of teaching the Principles of the Church of England, in which, as a Clergyman in my own Parish, if I were not restrained by Circumstances, I should desire to give to all the most perfect System of Education, inculcating the Principles of the Church of England, and teaching its Catechisms; but for a mixed Community I think the System is applicable.

You say before you came to England you received Instructions from the Committee of the Kildare Place Society; you have left those Instructions in Ireland?
Yes.

Did not you think you should want to refer to your Instructions?
They were very general, and I was given to understand that they were general.

You have been a long while employed as such, and those Instructions are perhaps in your Recollection?
Yes.

How long ago did you receive them?
I received them on my Appointment in April 1833.

You do not mean to say they were renewed to you upon your coming over here lately?
No, not at all.

You have come over on a Mission from them?
Yes; I intended only to stay a Month in England. If your Lordships wish to see those Instructions, I shall have only to write for them, and get them by Return of Post; but I did not think it necessary to bring them.

Have you had Occasion to see whether the System of the National Society operates partially either to Protestants or Roman Catholics?
I think it acts partially to both in the working of it; I do not know, in strict Conformity to the Rules, whether it is partial to either, but in the South of Ireland I have observed the very few National Schools I have seen are peculiarly Roman Catholic, and in the North of Ireland there is an Effort to make them appear conformable to the Views of the Protestants.

Does this Effort ever produce any disingenuous Conduct, as far as you have observed?
I cannot say any thing as to the Roman Catholic Schools in the South of Ireland, how far that may have the Effect; but I have been led to fear that in the North of Ireland the Constitution of the Board and the Circumstances of the

Rev. J. Graham.

the Country operate to produce Hypocrisy in the Teachers; that they are tempted to give their Promise in whatever Way it is asked from them to obey the Rules of the Board; and afterwards, in working out the School, they wish to make it appear as much Protestant as they can. I judge of that particularly from One Case that came under my Observation.

Will you state that Case?

It is the Case of Magheramore to which I have referred, in the Parish of Desertoghill. The Teacher of that School under the National Board has represented to me that he used the Scriptures as much when he was under the National Board as before, when he was under the Kildare Place Society; and I observed he contrived in a very ingenious Way both to appear to keep the Rules of the Society and to keep his School as he did before.

Who was the Teacher?

His Name is Matthew M'Neary.

In what Way did he use the Scriptures, being the Way in which he had been before in the habit of using them?

I should not wish to be understood to bring a Charge against the Schoolmaster, but I will state what I saw. In reference to the Tendency of the Board to tempt Men thus to accommodate the System to Protestants in the North and to Roman Catholics in the South, there is a Rule that if the Scriptures are read, that Hour must be distinct from School Hours, and Notice given of it in the School; that School in general opened at Nine o'Clock in Summer; the Hour of closing was Two or Three o'Clock, I do not recollect which; the School opened at Ten in Winter. He told me that from Nine till Ten in Summer, and from Ten till Eleven in Winter, was the Hour which he set apart for reading the Bible; so that in fact they were School Hours, and therefore he wished to make me think that he complied with the Rules of the Board, and kept his School as he did before; there was a public Notice in the School.

In what respect do you conceive that Conduct on his Part to have been inconsistent with the System of the Board?

I think, if he considered the Hour from Nine to Ten, or Ten to Eleven, the Part in which the Bible was read, a Part of the School Hours, and if he told the Parents that they were not separate from School Hours, and that was generally understood, it was inconsistent with the Rule which requires that the Bible shall not be used in School Hours; but the Existence of that Rule in a Protestant District is a Temptation to a Breach of the Board Regulation.

Was there any Notice that the Bible would be read at such a particular Time?

Yes.

Was he a Protestant Teacher?

He was a Presbyterian.

You stated that the System, as far as you observed, acted partially both towards Roman Catholics and Protestants in different Parts of Ireland; that it was against the Roman Catholics in the North, and against the Protestants in the South. Do you mean that, as far as you have observed, the Tendency of the System is to make a Protestant Minority of Children in the South, and a Roman Catholic Minority in the North, or that it has a Tendency to do one of those Things and not the other?

The Tendency in the South is certainly to make the Protestants Roman Catholics.

On the other hand, has it in the North of Ireland a Tendency to make the Roman Catholics Protestants?

Not so much to make the Roman Catholics Protestants as to satisfy the Protestants that there will be a Sufficiency of the Scriptures in the School when in fact there will not.

How do you account for its having one Effect in the one Case and another in the other?

I think the Difference is, that in the South of Ireland the Board Schools were before and are now generally conducted under the Roman Catholic Clergy, and that in them the Roman Catholic Principles and not the Prin-

Rev. J. Graham.

ciples of the Church of England, have been taught, but in the North of Ireland they were chiefly before conducted upon general Principles, and without Catechisms. They were not generally Schools such as in a peculiarly Roman Catholic Neighbourhood even would then or now have as great a Tendency to make the Roman Catholic Children Protestants as the Schools in the South to make Protestants Roman Catholics.

Do you think there is as much Desire on the Part of the Clergy of the Church of Ireland to convert the Roman Catholics as there is on the Part of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland to convert the Protestants?

I can scarcely speak to that in all its Bearings; I think the Desire of every Clergyman of the Established Church who is at all impressed with serious Views of Religion is that Roman Catholics should become Protestants; how far the Roman Catholic Priests in the South of Ireland desire I can speak to only from general Report, but I do not mean to say that in the Schools instituted for general Instruction Means have been taken by Protestant Clergymen to bring over the Children of Roman Catholics.

Have you any Reason to believe that any undue Means have been taken either by the Roman Catholics or Protestants for that Purpose?

No decided Instances have come within my own Knowledge.

Would that not be a Deviation from the general Instructions the Teachers received, if they were disposed to make Converts during the Hours of general Instruction?

I think any Interference on Religious Subjects during the School Hours would be a decided Breach of the Rules of the new Board, but I have seen Breaches. I recollect an Instance in which the Spirit at least of the Rules, I conceive, was violated in the Instruction given in the School called, I think, the Brickfield School; there I found One Protestant Child in the School; the Master told me that it was the Day set apart for separate Religious Instruction. I asked him whether this Protestant Child was separately instructed in Protestant Principles, and he said no; that the Parents did not send any Books. I asked him how the Child was instructed; he said the Child had the Books of other Boys in the School. I went to the Child and found him out; he was reading a Book that is not upon the List of the National Board, a small Roman Catholic Publication called Lessons for Lent, and I inferred from that that the Child was in great Danger of being brought over to the Roman Catholic Religion.

Did you inquire how the Book came into the Child's Hands?

I do not know that I put the Question in reference to how that particular Book came into the Child's Hands, but I did put the Question as to how the Child was supplied with Books. I found the Child read it because the other Boys did so; it was evidently with the Master's Consent.

Did you make any Representation to the Protestant Clergyman of the Parish of this?

I did not.

Or to the Board?

No.

This was the Day for separate Religious Education?

Yes.

How came the Child to be there, being a Protestant Child?

I cannot say how the Child came to be there; but there is a Difficulty in understanding the Expression as it is used by the new Board, separate Religious Instruction; whether it is to be separate from secular Instruction only, or also that the Protestant and Roman Catholic Children are to be separated the one from the other.

Was not there Provision made in the Kildare Place Society for separate Religious Instruction?

Yes; they were favourable to it out of School Hours. That School is an Instance, I think, of the injurious Tendency of the Scriptural Extracts; I saw in it, as I saw in several others, what led me to think that the Children of the Roman Catholics generally, so far as they would be influenced by what passed

in

153

Rev. J. Graham.

in the Schools, would forget eventually what the Bible was, and, mistaking those Extracts, confound them with the Scriptures. I asked leave to examine a Class in that School in the Scripture Extracts, and I did so, and they could not give me a clear Account of what the Books were. They called the First Book of the Old Testament Scripture Lessons. The Old Testament I have subsequently found in other Schools; the same Mistake was made when they went further into it. I asked the Boys successively whether they had any other Book of the same Kind besides this, which they styled the Old Testament; they said they had "the New Testament;" so that they distinctly called the Extracts from the Old Testament the Old Testament, and the Extracts from the New Testament the New Testament. In another School I asked a Child with the Lessons in his Hand what Book he read; he said it was the Testament. I asked him what Testament, I asked him what the Testament was, but he could not tell me.

Did you understand from them that they thought that Book was the whole of the Old Testament?

I could scarcely say I understood them to mean that, for I do not think they knew what the whole of the Old Testament is; but I think that there was a confused Idea in their Minds with reference to the Scriptures, and I found the Mistress of one of the Schools called them by the same Name.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

155

Die Veneris, 17° *Martii* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

CHARLES WILLIAM HAMILTON Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

Have you been employed in Ireland on the Poor Law Commission?
I was one of the volunteer Assistant Commissioners. I did not act as Assistant Commissioner, but I acted in company with Three of the chief Commissioners, who made a Tour over most Part of Ireland, for the Purpose of Inquiry into Subjects connected with the Business of the Poor Inquiry Commission.

You have for some Time felt an Interest in the Subject of Irish Education, have you not?
Very much so.

Did you take an Opportunity, in your Visits through Ireland as attached to the Poor Law Commission, to inspect the Schools in the Districts into which you went?
I never lost an Opportunity of visiting any School that lay in the Road on which we travelled; but at the same Time I must state that it was my Business to take distinct Notes with reference to the Poor Inquiry; and as I visited the Schools merely for the sake of my own Information, of course the Observations that I made are not recorded, and I can only give generally the Result of the Impressions that remained upon my Mind.

Have you had an Opportunity of considering the different Systems of Education which have been applied to the Poor in that Country?
Yes; I have for many Years been in the habit of attending Schools under Two or Three of the different Societies, and also visiting those in England.

Have you considered the Rules and Regulations upon which the existing System is established?
Yes.

Do you consider, under the Circumstances in which that Country is placed, the existing System is, in Theory, applicable to the Wants of the People?
No; I do not think it is extensive enough.

It is the Wish of the Committee to distinguish the System as laid down by the Commissioners or by Lord Stanley's Letter, supposing that to be attended to correctly and carried into effect without Abuse, from the Mode in which it may be practically carried on?
I am sure that what I understood as being the Spirit of Lord Stanley's Instructions would have produced a most beneficial System of Education for Ireland.

What Part of the Country had you at first an Opportunity of visiting?
The South of Ireland, Limerick, and Cork.

In what Year did you go into that District?
1834.

Did you find the new System in operation in that Part of the Country at the Time?
Yes; I visited a great Number of Schools there, but did not take many Notes, for the Reason I stated before; but I was very much struck upon finding that so many Schools had been taken under the Protection of the Board

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

in which I could not find either the Books of the Board introduced or that any Change had taken place which materially altered the Character of the School from that of the old Irish Hedge School. In many Instances of course the Schools were very well conducted, but in many others I was disappointed on finding that so little Improvement had been carried into effect.

The System had then been in operation about Three Years, had it not?
Two Years, I think.

Do you mean in those Parts where you perceived in particular Schools this Want of Improvement?
Yes.

In the generality of Schools you visited did you find the Books of the Society in use?
In a very great Number of them I found no Books belonging to the Society in use; in many of course there were. I cannot exactly state the Proportion, but it was quite sufficient to lead me to think the Rules of the Board ought to be strictly enforced.

Can you state the Schools?
No, I have a Difficulty in doing that; I happen to have a Reference to one of the Schools which I found in my Note Book, Inch St. Lawrence, near Caherconlish in the County of Limerick.

In what Counties did you visit the Schools in your Tour through the South of Ireland?
We passed through Limerick, Kerry, Cork, Waterford, and Tipperary, and some intervening Counties.

Pretty nearly the South of Ireland?
Yes, except Wexford.

Are there any Schools you can specify as having come under your particular Notice?
I specify this one of Inch St. Lawrence, for it was the one of which I find a Note in my own Note Book. I visited other Schools in which I found no Books, but I have taken no Notes of them.

Can you specify any other?
I had rather not specify any others.

Do you confine your Statement as to there being no Books to the Books of the Board?
There were no Board Books except a few Spelling Books; the Books chiefly used were the Universal Spelling Book.

What Books did you find in the Hands of the Children?
Chiefly the Universal Spelling Book.

Is that one of the Books circulated by the Board?
No, it is not; it is the principal Book which has been hitherto used in the Hedge Schools in Ireland.

Did you inquire at the Time why the Scripture Extracts and other Books recommended by the Board were not used in that School?
I may have inquired, though I do not remember the Answer; but there was a very sufficient Reason,—there was a Difficulty in raising the Money to pay the Half Price for the Books.

Did you find any Books of an improper Character in any of those Schools; Books of a Nature that ought not to be in Schools?
Yes; I have very frequently found very improper Books; but to any one acquainted with the Hedge Schools in Ireland, and who knows the Custom which obtains, of the Children bringing their own Books for the Purpose of learning to read out of them, it would not appear wonderful that Books of a very extraordinary Nature should frequently be found.

Can you state any School in which you have found such Books at that Period, and what the Books were?
No, I cannot. I remember finding Books, and Books of a very improper Nature, but I cannot state the particular School.

In

157

In the School at Inch St. Lawrence did you find Books of that Description? No, I do not recollect having done so. *C. W. Hamilton, Esq.*

What Books did you find in any particular School?
I found chiefly the Universal Spelling Book in many of them.

Did you make any Representation to the Board, or any Person connected with it, as to the Insufficiency of the Supply of Books?
Yes; I remember having done so.

To whom?
I think to Mr. Carlile. I have frequently spoken about the Schools, and have always been met with the greatest Attention and Readiness to inquire into what the Circumstances stated were.

Did you make a Statement with regard to this particular School of Inch St. Lawrence?
If my Memory does not deceive me, I did; but the Matter having passed so long ago I cannot be certain; but I have been frequently in the habit of conversing with Mr. Carlile and Mr. Kelly on the Subject of the Schools.

Did you make any Note in the Book in the School so as to attract the Attention of those who visited it?
That I cannot tell.

You do not recollect any Circumstances in that Tour that enable you to give any Information with respect to any particular School?
No; I should be sorry to give any Information upon distinct Points which did not come from Notes; and not having taken any Notes, I should beg to have my Examination referred merely to the general Impressions left upon my own Mind after a very careful Inspection.

Do not you think it would have been very easy to get Persons to give Information to this Committee who could have given more than general Impressions?
Indeed I should hope that there would be People much better qualified, and who have given up their Time more to prepare themselves for such an Examination, which I have not had the Opportunity of doing, never having expected to be called upon.

Can you tell at all how many Schools you visited during this Tour?
No, I cannot mention the Number.

Did you make any Minute in any one School of the Mismanagement of that School?
I must decline answering upon the Subject; not having Notes, it is impossible for me to answer that.

You were very much struck with the Want of Improvement in those Schools, and you were surprised to find them so little superior to the old Hedge Schools of Ireland?
I was.

You have been in the habit of turning your Attention to Education, and particularly to this System, for some Time?
Yes.

And you highly approved of the Spirit of Lord Stanley's Instructions?
Yes.

And you thought they would lead to a great deal of Improvement, if followed out properly?
Yes.

Do you know how long those Schools had been established which manifested so little Improvement?
At the Time, of course, on referring to the Books, I saw how long they had been established, and that gave me Information when I inquired, and enabled me to form my own Judgment; but as I had no Idea of ever being called upon to communicate the Premises from which I made my Deductions to any

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

one else, of course it rested, as many general Deductions do, in one's own Mind when the Minutiæ of the Premises may be lost.

You thought they had been established long enough to give ample Time for Improvement?
Yes.

And in that State of Improvement you expected to find them?
Yes.

And in that Expectation you were disappointed?
I was.

You made no Record of that Disappointment in the Books of the Schools?
I have been in the habit of Writing in the Books of the Schools, and I have of course always written what my Opinion was, when I had an Opportunity; but I cannot pretend to recollect the particular Occasions.

You cannot remember that in any of those Cases you have recorded your Opinion?
No, I cannot.

Can you remember whether you informed the Board of the Mismanagement of those Schools in the Case of any one of them?
I know that I have frequently spoken to Members of the Board upon the Subject.

The Question respects those Schools you visited in your Tour in the Year 1834?
I cannot add to what I stated before of my general Recollection of having frequently spoken to Persons connected with the Commission upon the Subject, and being as frequently told that it was what was most desired by the Commissioners, and that every Attention would be paid to such Representations.

Have you a general Recollection of having spoken to the Board, and informed them of the Mismanagement of those Schools that you visited during your Tour in 1834?
I certainly have.

You have spoken to them about them?
I have.

When was it you spoke; immediately on your Return from the Tour?
I cannot remember the exact Time; but between that Time and this I remember having a long Conversation with Mr. Carlile and Mr. Blake upon the Subject, in the Board Room.

With respect to these particular Schools?
With respect to a Number of Schools in which there was not an adequate Supply of proper Books.

The Question is, whether you made any Communication with respect to those particular Schools which disappointed you so much in the Year 1834?
I can only repeat my former Answer, that without having made Notes of particular Instances in which I found Fault, or of the particular Conversations I may have had from Time to Time with those Members of the Board I was in the habit of frequently seeing, it would be impossible for me to give a more accurate Answer to your Lordship's Question.

The Question is as to your general Recollection. You recollect having been very much disappointed at the Want of Improvement in those Schools; under those Circumstances did you, on the first Opportunity that presented itself, communicate to the Board your Disappointment at that Want of Improvement, and the Misconduct, as it appeared to you, which was taking place in those Schools, you being in the habit of communicating with the Members of the Board?
My Desire has always been to do so.

Did you do so in this Case, so far as your general Recollection goes?
I hardly know how to answer further than I have done.

159

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

Can you take upon you to say that you have in any One Instance mentioned to any Member of the Board the Name of any One School you have visited, and where you have found this?
I am certain that I have, in more than One Instance.

What was the Name of the School you mentioned?
That I cannot pretend to say.

Do you remember to have mentioned the Name of any One Book which you objected to to any One Member of the Board?
It is very hard to answer that, because I am certain I have often mentioned Books, and discussed the Matter of the Books; but I do not understand what Kind of Answer the Question requires.

Have you ever mentioned to any Member of the Board the Name of any One Book which you considered improper, and which you had met with in any One School?
Yes.

Will you name the particular Book you mentioned as having found, and which you considered an improper Book?
Selections from Lord Chesterfield's Letters, and the History of Ireland.

Is that a History of Ireland in Question and Answer?
There is a small Work, a History of Ireland, which I have very often met with in the Schools, and is not at all an uncommon Book in Schools where the Children bring their own Books; that I know I have met with in many Instances; and I know I have talked of such Matters, but it was in a general Way; but I think that it is expecting too much that I should remember either the particular Time at which I have objected to any One of those, or the particular Book which might have formed Part of the Conversation; not of course having any Idea of the Necessity of recording it, it must remain as a general Impression upon my Mind.

Did you mention the History of Ireland as an improper Book you had found in any one of those Schools to any Member of the Board?
I must decline to answer that Question.

Was the History of Ireland a Work known to you before?
Only as a Book I have occasionally taken up in the common Hedge Schools; from its general Character I never have wished to read it; but I always knew when I found it it was not a Book which ought to be put into the Hands of Children.

You knew sufficient of it to know it was an improper Book to be put into the Hands of Children?
I knew that was its Character.

Do you happen to recollect whether that History of Ireland is in Question and Answer?
I do not recollect that.

What is there in this particular Book to make it so objectionable?
Its general Character is that of being an objectionable Book.

How do you know its Character, not having read it?
I have heard its Character from the Report of those who have read it.

This objectionable Book which you found in those Schools you did not look into enough to know whether the History was conveyed in Question and Answer?
I may have done so, and probably did so at the Time; but I do not recollect at present the Circumstances.

You do not recollect whether the Book they object to was in Question and Answer; is there any other History of Ireland objectionable which is not in Question and Answer?
I am not aware of any Book under that Name peculiarly fitted for the Instruction of very young Children.

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

You mention this Book as having been formerly used in the Hedge Schools; is not the Book which is objected to a Book in Question and Answer?
That I do not know.

You did not look into this Book sufficiently to know whether it was in Question and Answer, or in the Form of Narrative?
No.

Do you consider that you have enabled yourself to give that satisfactory Information to the Committee which they have a Right to expect?
It is impossible for me to know what is the peculiar Information which your Lordships may wish to have from me, and therefore of course it is difficult for me to answer that Question. The Position in which I stand here is not that of a Person who has offered Evidence, but as one whose only Connexion with the Board was that of having taken an Interest in its Proceedings, as having been one of the Applicants for a School and a Manager of a School under the Board, and having done my best to procure Information as to general Matters, but not as inculpating the Board on any particular Point. I should perhaps, if I had had Time, have looked out for particular Instances and taken Notes.

You say that the History of Ireland was objectionable in your Mind, not from any Inspection you have yourself made of it, but from its Character; was its Character notorious?
Yes. There are a Number of Books notorious to those who have been in the habit of visiting the Hedge Schools, and that is one of them.

Notorious in what respect?
As a Book in which there is no Good to be learnt, and a great deal which I believe to be wrong.

Is it immoral; is it seditious; does it inculcate rebellious Principles; does it inculcate vehemently Roman Catholic Principles; or is it fanatical?
It is hard to expect me to answer on the Character of a Book I do not profess to have read.

What do you mean by the Word notorious?
I mean that I have frequently read Statements of the Names of those Books which were supposed by those who have paid Attention to the Schools in Ireland to be very improper Books; and it has always occurred among them, and I never felt any Inclination to read it, nor did I feel myself called upon to do so.

Did you find the History of Ireland in many of the Schools under the National Board in 1834?
I mention having found this, because it is in my Recollection clear that I have found it in some Instances; but further I cannot say.

Are you the Writer of a Pamphlet, now before the Committee, called "Observations on a Speech by the Lord Bishop of Exeter"?
I am.

There is in it this Passage:—"Can it be possible that I have found Children in a National School busy reading the Life of 'Freny the Robber,' and 'Instructions upon the Art of handling their Cards genteelly,' &c. &c.?" Can you state that you found in any of the Schools connected with the National Board of Education the Books just named?
Yes, for I then consulted my Note Books; but I really cannot now state where the exact School was. I know that I have taken them out of the Children's Hands in a School at Skibbereen or Clonakilty in the County of Cork, or on that Line of Road; but further I cannot say.

You have stated that you have found in Schools connected with the National Board of Education those Books you have named?
Yes.

When was that?
In 1834.

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

You are sure they were Schools connected with the Board of Education?
Yes, I am quite sure of that, the Impression remains so strong upon my Mind that the Schools were connected with the Board of Education.

Was the Title written up "National School"?
Certainly, or else I should not have had such an Impression upon my Mind.

You have no distinct Idea that you reported this to the Board without Loss of Time?
No; the Fact is, I was not called upon to report on any One of those Matters; it was not my Business.

You did not consider it your official Duty to report what you had seen of those Schools on your Return to Dublin?
Certainly not.

Not only not your official Duty, but not the Duty of a Person anxious for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, and anxious to promote this particular School; in that Capacity you did not consider yourself bound to report what you had seen at those Schools?
In that Capacity I did not feel myself bound to give a Return of particular Instances of Schools under the Management of other Persons whom the Board had thought fit to have the Management intrusted to, but I should have thought myself to have failed very much in my Duty if I had lost any Opportunity of representing any thing which I thought defective in the Management of Schools in general.

Have you any Recollection, either particular or general, of having made a Representation to the Board of having seen those particular Books in Schools in 1834?
I believe I may refer to a former Answer, that I cannot specify particular Instances.

Have you any Recollection of having made this Representation of those particular Facts?
I cannot specify Instances.

Can you recollect having made a specific Entry in the Books of the School of having discovered those Books in the Hands of the Scholars?
I cannot.

Can you recollect that you did at any Time state to the Board, or any Member of the Board, that this particular Book, which you now describe, had been found in use in any Schools connected with the Board?
I cannot state that I did or that I did not; but I think the Probability is, that I did mention it.

You state that you found the Children busily reading the Life of 'Freny the Robber' and 'Instructions upon the Art of handling their Cards genteelly;' when you say you found them busily reading them, were those Books such as the Boys had put into their Pockets without the Knowledge of their Master, or were they reading them with the Knowledge of the Master of the School? What was the Impression upon your Mind?
The Impression on my Mind was, they were used as the Books that the Children bring with them. They are generally used in the Hedge Schools as the Books to learn to read from; when each Child uses its own Book, and there is no System of Uniformity prevailing in the School.

Do you mean to say that this System prevailed in those National Schools where you found this Book?
Certainly it must have prevailed where there were no National School Books.

Are the Committee to understand that the Master, according to your Impression, was cognizant of the Fact that the Boys were reading in the School, as their School Books, the History of Freny the Robber and the Way to handle their Cards genteelly?
Certainly.

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

Did you speak to the Master upon that Subject?
I suppose I did, but I really cannot recollect the Circumstance. It must be remembered this is not an Instance I have taken by way of informing myself and producing Evidence upon it; but those few Words are the only Extract I have made from my Note Book, and to which of course I can refer, as confirming my Observation; further than that I really cannot charge my Memory.

You stated that you believed the Master was cognizant of the Boys reading this Book?
From the general System obtaining in Schools, for each Child to bring his Book, and to use that Book as the Means of learning the Art of reading.

Having remarked that this Book was a Book which you considered an improper Book, the Life of 'Freny the Robber', and 'Instructions upon the Art of handling Cards genteelly', did you not think it proper to call the Attention of the Master to that Subject?
I think the Probability is, that I should have done as I have often done in other Schools, rather lament to the Master the Want of proper Books, and pointed out to him the Mode of applying for a better Class of Books, and the Necessity of doing so. That has been my Conduct in many other Cases.

Will you state for the Information of the Committee your Object when you set out with the Commissioners of Poor Laws in visiting the Schools?
Because I had for many Years considered that one great Means of improving the Condition of the Irish Peasantry would be to give them a better System of Education; and of course any Person living in Ireland whose Wish is to see that great Improvement take place will not lose the Opportunity of inquiring into the System in operation.

Where you had any spare Time you went into the Schools on the Line of Road?
I did.

Did you consider it your Duty, upon your Return to Dublin, to make a Report to the Commissioners of the National Schools of what you had observed in the respective Schools in that Line?
I did not.

Have you within the last Six Weeks visited a School in the County of Kildare?
I have. I accidentally went in to see a Female School at Clare, in the County of Kildare. I found a very respectable Mistress, but no Books belonging to the School. I asked her why she had not Books. She told me there was no Fund for paying the Half Price for the Books. I suggested to her, as far as possible, the Mode of getting a Subscription, and of applying to the Board for them; but from what she said to me it really appeared to me there was no Person in the Neighbourhood who would be likely to subscribe.

Did you ascertain who the Patrons of that School were?
Not further than referring to the Appendix to the Third Report of the Commissioners, in which that is stated.

Did the Mistress tell you that she had applied for Books?
She told me she had no Money to meet the necessary Expense.

Was she a Roman Catholic?
I do not think I inquired that.

The Schoolmistress told you Six Months ago she could get no Books because she had not any Subscription?
Yes.

Were you aware there had been a gratuitous Distribution of Books to all Schools several Months before that?
Yes, I think the Spelling Books, in the very Beginning, as far as my Memory serves me, were given.

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

Did you mention to the Mistress that they were distributed gratuitously, and that it must have been an Omission if she was not supplied?
I told her she ought to make an Application without reference to Subscription; though I did not know what the Board might do.

Did you state to the Board on your Return that she had given that Reason for not having Books?
No; I did not feel myself called upon to do that.

Were there other Books in the School?
Yes; there were Scholars learning.

How do you know they were not the Books of the Board?
Because I asked the Mistress the Question.

Do you know how long the School had been established?
No.

How many Children were there in the School?
A Reference to the Appendix will state that. There were about 100 Girls; as far as I can recollect that was the Number.

If your Object was to have the Abuse corrected, do not you think the more natural Course would have been to have communicated with those who had the Power of correcting it, namely, the Members of the Board?
I should have thought it ought to be a very strong Circumstance that would call for my Interference with the authorized Managers of a School, whoever they might be; I did not feel myself called upon to interfere with any School except that of which I am Manager.

Though you did not find any Circumstances strong enough to induce you to feel it your Duty to make a Representation to the Board, you did find Facts strong enough to justify your coming forward to inculpate those by whom it is conducted?
I am not inculpating them; I am answering only as to my own Feelings from what I saw.

With what Object did you visit this School?
The Object which has always taken me into the School, to see the Manner in which Education is carried on in different Places.

Were you staying in the Neighbourhood?
I was passing through the Place, going to my Home Ten Miles distant.

If you did not think those Circumstances strong enough to justify you in making a Representation to those who might correct the Abuse, do you think them strong enough to justify you in writing a Pamphlet which throws Imputation upon the Commissioners?
I think that when any Subject is brought before the Public it is desirable that those who see that Subject in any particular Light should put forward their Views as a Matter of Discussion; and the Writer of an anonymous Article in a Newspaper or in a Pamphlet does not come forward as a public Accuser.

He does not make himself responsible as a public Accuser; but does not he incur the Risk of making those Charges where they could not be sustained, and without the Hope of their being corrected?
Certainly; if an anonymous Writer states any thing which he does not believe to be the Fact, I think then he falls under a Liability to Censure of the strongest Character.

You feel your Belief of the Fact would warrant you in writing a Pamphlet inculpating the System, but not in applying to the Board to have the Practice corrected; will you explain that?
I do not feel that I should be justified in writing a particular Pamphlet naming a particular School, and bringing an Accusation against it, without having first gone to the Manager or the Board to state particular Circumstances; but in speaking generally of any one System, of course Instances and Illustrations may be drawn from particular Cases without a direct Interference with the Managers of those Schools?

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

You were in constant Communication, you state, with some of the Commissioners?

I was in the habit of seeing them occasionally, and talking upon the Subject of the Schools.

In those constant Conversations did you not mention these Facts?

I may have done so or not; but I would distinctly state that I did not feel myself called upon in any Instance in which I was not interested personally in the School to make any Observation upon it to the Board.

The Number of Girls you state, upon the Book at this School of Clare, were Fifty?

I have stated that I believed the Number was given in the Appendix to the Report as One hundred and three.

Did there appear to be a fair Proportion of those present on that Day?

No. The Mistress told me that was the Time in which they were rather few; that there had been a much greater Attendance; but I did not enter into those Particulars.

How many appeared to you to be present, on your looking round the School?

There did not appear to be above Fifteen or Twenty; but it was just near the Hour of breaking up, and there were a good many had left, and it was merely the Workers who remained.

Are you yourself connected with any School under the Board?

I am, and have been for Two Years.

Can you speak with reference to that particular School?

I can.

What is that School called?

Ballinvally, in the County of Westmeath.

How many Children are there in that School?

At first the Number upon the Books was about 210; the average Attendance for the last Year was above 120; but they have fallen off within the last Six Months, being only between Forty and Fifty.

Is it for both Sexes?

Yes; there are both a Male and a Female School.

You have both a Master and a Mistress?

Yes.

Do you attend to that School yourself?

I do. I visit it occasionally; but it is at a considerable Distance.

Do the Clergy of both Persuasions attend that School?

They have done so until within the last Six Months; and since that Time the Roman Catholic Clergyman has withdrawn from attending it.

Does the Protestant Clergyman still attend it?

He attends very seldom.

What is the Proportion of Catholic and Protestant Children in that School?

That I really cannot state; but that there are some Protestants sometimes; perhaps One Fourth of them are Protestants.

You say that the Roman Catholic Clergyman has withdrawn from that School?

He has not visited it since September.

To what do you attribute that?

In the first instance the appointed Master and Mistress were both Roman Catholics; and after they had continued there about Nine Months, upon the Representation of the Roman Catholic Clergyman, and subsequent Investigation into the Character of the Master, I reported to the Board, and the Master was dismissed. I then tried to get the best Master that I could; and after having been for some Months advertising and doing my best to procure a good one, I met with Three or Four, One of whom I selected; and as I did not like

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

like to take it entirely upon myself, I sent the Statement and the Testimonials of Character to Mr. Kelly, the Secretary of the Board, stating, that as I had found that the Person who had the best Character was a Protestant, I did not wish to have the Responsibility of the Appointment. I thought perhaps the Priest might object to it. Mr. Kelly recommended that this Person should be appointed; that he thought he was the best Person; and I appointed him.

Are you the Patron?

I am the Manager of it. He was appointed. Upon that I received a very angry Letter from the Roman Catholic Clergyman, complaining of this Appointment. I went directly and called at the Office of the Board to speak to Mr. Kelly, to ask whether this should be attended to. I was told this should not be attended to; that the Object of the Board was not to consider the Distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics. I could find no other who was a proper Master. The Roman Catholic Clergyman did not immediately withdraw; he visited twice after that, but in September he insisted upon this Master teaching the Roman Catholic Catechism. The Master wrote up to me to know whether this was to be allowed. Of course I immediately went to the Board. I saw Mr. Blake, and spoke to him about it; he told me the Rule of the Board was that it should not be taught, and that the Master should be dismissed if it was taught. I wrote to the Master to tell him that that was the Case, and that he was not to teach the Roman Catholic Catechism in the School Hours; but that he was to open the School every Day it was possible after School Hours for the Roman Catholic Clergyman to teach in any Way he chose, and the Result of that has been that he has attempted to withdraw the Children from the School; it appears gradually falling off; but I have not felt myself called upon to take any Step towards dismissing the Master, who is at present in the Model School in Dublin, for the Purpose of acquiring better Qualification.

You conceive that because you refused to allow the Roman Catholic Catechism to be taught in School Hours the Priest has used some Pains to withdraw the Children from that School?

I do.

And that he has succeeded in a great measure?

Yes; because the average Attendance is diminished.

Has any Communication in fact taken place upon that particular Point?

Yes; I communicated with Mr. Kelly and Mr. Blake upon the Subject. I found I was completely borne out by their Authority in the Course I had pursued.

They told you you were perfectly right in continuing the Master in the School?

Yes; which they have given their Sanction to by taking him into the Model School.

You had been in the habit of visiting this School before the new Master was appointed?

Yes.

How far is it from your Residence?

It is about Thirty Miles; but I have the Management of the Property upon which it is situated, which leads me to visit it frequently.

Did the former Master teach the Roman Catholic Catechism in the School?

I believe not; I several Times had Information that it was done, and I always made it my Business to inquire at once into it, and I never found any Instance in which it had been done.

The Result of your Inquiry was your Belief that he did not do it?

The Result of that Inquiry was, that I have never found out that he did do it.

Do you believe that he did do it?

I have no Reason to believe that it was ever done, except that it is extraordinary that he, being a Roman Catholic, should have so long satisfied the

C. W. Hamilton, Esq.

Roman Catholic Clergyman, who so soon withdrew, expressing his Disapprobation of the Person who is the Successor.

Had you any Communication with the Roman Catholic Clergyman after his Withdrawment from the School in consequence of the Protestant Master being appointed?

The Communication I had with him from the Time of his writing me a very angry Letter was chiefly through the Board. He wrote, to complain of me to the Board, a very violent Letter; I had immediately a Summons to the Board to give Reasons against this, which I did, and I believe to the Satisfaction of the Board.

Did you state that the Protestant Clergyman had withdrawn too?

Not for the same Reason; he very seldom resides, and is in Ill-health; he has been very little able to attend the School, though he has done so occasionally.

Could the former Master, who was so long under your Inspection, have broken through one of the Rules of the National Board, and taught this Catechism without your Knowledge?

Very possibly; because, from the Circumstances, I was only an occasional Visitor.

Could he ever have taught that in the School without your knowing it?

I think so.

Did you not, as Patron of the School, inquire, whenever you visited, into the working of it?

I did.

Have you Reason to believe that under the former Master it was well conducted?

Certainly it was, for the first Six Months, I believe; they were very well satisfied with him; I saw that the Children were well taught; his Wife was taking a great deal of Pains; but he subsequently became a drunken Character.

His Dismissal was not in consequence of any Infringement of the Rules of the School, but for immoral Conduct?

Yes.

That School was well supplied with Books probably?

Yes.

Are the Scripture Extracts used in that School?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Rev. J. Brown.

The Reverend JOHN BROWN is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Minister of the Synod of Ulster?

I am.

Have you ever served the Office of Moderator?

Yes.

How many Years ago?

I was chosen in June 1832, and retired at the same Time in 1833.

You have an extensive Knowledge of the Matters of the Synod and the Presbyterian Body generally?

I do not boast of an extensive Knowledge, but I am acquainted with a great many of their Proceedings.

You know the Members of the Body, and the Distinctions that prevail among those called Presbyterians in Ireland?

Yes; I have paid Attention to those Matters.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Witness is again called in.

You

Rev. J. Brown.

You well know what Clergymen called Presbyterians in Ireland are Members of the Synod of Ulster, and who are not?
Generally, I should suppose.

How many Members of the Synod of Ulster are there?
We have 256 Congregations.

Are there 256 Members of the Synod, or more?
More, I presume; a few of them are Collegiate Charges; the Dublin Congregations for example, and the Derry.

In the Appendix to the Third Report there is a List of Presbyterian Clergymen who have signed Applications to the Commissioners of Education for Aid that has been granted up to the present Time, noting the Persons who have signified their Desire to withdraw their Signatures; have you seen that List?
I believe I have.

Could you easily inform the Committee how many of the Names there given are Members of the Synod of Ulster?
I could readily, by making a Calculation which will take some Time. Your Lordships will perceive one Difficulty, that though the Name of the County and the Place is given, the Congregation is not given; therefore there might be a Difficulty in that, and I should be extremely unwilling to make any Mistake upon that Subject.

Will you do it as well as you can, stating any Difficulties which may arise in it?
I will, certainly, if it is the Wish of your Lordships.

Could you point out the Remonstrants as well as those who were of the Synod of Munster?
I presume I could do it with tolerable Accuracy; but inasmuch as the Name of the Congregation is not attached, there is a Possibility that there may be a Blunder, which I would anxiously wish to avoid.

In the List before you are there the Names of any Persons who have been degraded?
There is the Name of John Doherty; and if that be the Minister of Donegore, that Person is degraded, and dead.

Degraded for what?
He was degraded for Intemperance; he is now dead. When I have no Address of the Individual before me, inasmuch as there might be Two of the same Name, I might commit a Mistake; I feel very anxious to avoid that.

Do you know of your own Knowledge that he was degraded?
Yes.

Do you know whether he had been degraded before he made his Application to the Board?
I should suppose not.

Did you ever hear that that Person had applied to the Board for a School?
No; I never was aware of it till I saw his Name there. There is the Name of J. A. D. Gibson; if that Gentleman resides at Balliwater, or somewhere near Donaghadee, that Person was degraded many Years since.

Degraded for what?
For Immorality.

Did he continue to act as Minister?
He collected round him a Faction of disorderly People.

Had he a Congregation attending upon him?
Yes, he was still connected with this disorderly Party.

What do you mean by disorderly Party; a disorderly Congregation?
Yes.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do you mean that they are all Persons of improper Character?
No; but opposed to all manner of Discipline. They did not acquiesce in the Decision of the Body, and determined to retain him.

By disorderly, you mean kicking at the Order by which he was expelled?
Yes.

They were refractory with respect to the Decrees and Orders of your Church?
Yes.

That Person did continue the Preacher to a Congregation?
Yes, and is so to the present Day, I believe.

The Board, in returning him as a Presbyterian Clergyman, probably had no Means of knowing what were the Opinions of the Congregation he preached to, or whether they were disorderly in any other respect than refusing to abide by the Determination of the Synod?
The Cause of the Degradation was inserted in the Minutes of the Synod, and known to the World.

Do you know whether this Immorality took place previous to his Connexion with the Board, or subsequently?
It was many Years ago; long before the Existence of the Board.

How many Years ago?
I cannot charge my Memory; but I should think at least Ten.

Has that Course of Immorality been continued?
Of course we know nothing of him since that Time.

The Man may have been completely reformed since that Time?
It is possible.

He has not been re-elected into the Synod?
No.

Could he in any Case be re-elected into the Synod?
No.

You consider it as final when a Person is expelled?
Yes, in such Cases. There have been Instances of Persons being suspended; but when Degradation takes place I have never known an Instance of the Person being reinstated in his Office.

Therefore, even if this Gentleman had become an exemplary Character he could not have been reinstated?
I have never known a Case of the Sort, when on account of those flagrant Breaches of Propriety Individuals have been expelled. There have been Instances of Application for Re-admission; but I have never known any one attended to. There is another Person on the List, of the Name of Skelley, who has Twice applied, and been refused.

What Number of Persons attend the Congregation of Mr. Gibson?
We have no Means of knowing that.

Are there a considerable Number?
I dare say there are.

You know of no other Exception to the Character of the Congregation than their refusing to acquiesce in the Decision of the Synod?
No; I dare say it was from a strong Attachment to the Individual, and Sympathy and Pity for the unfortunate Man.

Do you think that they would attend upon him if they did not consider him a reformed Person and a Moral Person?
We know from Experience there is a Sympathy towards an unfortunate Man that will attract round him a Number of Friends.

Do you think they would continue to attend upon him if he continued in a Course of Immorality?
Yes, I am afraid so.

169

Rev. J. Brown.

There was another Person appointed in his Room when he was dismissed, was there not?

Yes; the Party who were attached to us chose another.

Those who still attend Mr. Gibson are not obliged to do so from the Want of a spiritual Adviser?

No, certainly not.

Will you have the goodness to look at No. 2. in Page 2. of the Return now shown to you, containing a List of Presbyterian Clergymen who are Correspondents with the Board for Schools; One of the Names is the Rev. J. A. D. Gibson, of whom you have been speaking; will you see whether there is any other in that List who has been degraded for Immorality?

I see the Name of the Rev. William Skelley in the County of Down.

Was he degraded for Immorality?

Yes.

For what Species of Immorality; Drunkenness, Incontinence, or what?

Incontinence.

How long ago?

I should suppose about Twelve or Thirteen Years ago; not having any Documents to refer to I cannot pretend to perfect Accuracy upon that Subject.

Has he a Congregation?

Yes; he attracted around him a Party of People who sympathized with him.

At Donaghadee?

Yes.

Do you mean that they sympathized with him in his Incontinence or in his Misfortune?

In his Misfortune.

Does he continue to exercise the pastoral Office?

Yes.

Does his Immorality continue, or has he reformed?

I have no Means of knowing that Fact.

You do not know that he is not reformed?

No.

Do you know him?

I do.

What Age is he?

I cannot say accurately; I suppose he may be a Person of Fifty Years of Age. He, twice since his Degradation, applied to our Body to be re-admitted, and he was rejected. At one Time there was a Committee to examine the State of the Case.

There was a Committee to inquire whether he ought to be reinstated or not?

Yes.

They determined against him?

They did.

Do you know on what Grounds they determined against him?

No; I was not a Member of that Committee.

When you state that those Gentlemen were displaced, do you mean that they were merely banished from their Pulpits, or altogether put out of the Connexion, or excommunicated by the Synod?

They were excommunicated by the Synod; a Judicial Sentence was pronounced by which they were excluded from us.

They ceased to belong to the Synod altogether?

Yes.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do they receive any Portion of the Regium Donum?
No.

That they were deprived of from the Circumstance of their being expelled from the Body?
Yes.

Do you mean that no Persons who have ceased to be Members of the Synod receive any Portion of the Regium Donum?
No; but there have been some Cases of late where Persons have evaded our Discipline and passed to another Body, and still continue to receive the Regium Donum.

Do you not believe that the Remonstrants,—the Persons who have separated from the Synod,—continue to receive the Regium Donum?
I know they do.

Do you know that any Persons who have been degraded for Immorality receive any Portion of the Regium Donum?
I believe not.

Those Persons so degraded have not joined any other Sect of Presbyterians?
No; they would not be admitted.

Will you refer to the Rev. S. Love, Temple Meeting House, Derrynose; have you any Remark to make upon his Name?
He has been degraded.

For what?
Immorality.

Of what Species of Immorality?
The same Species.

How long ago?
That was a late Transaction.

How long ago?
I believe within the last Year.

Then it was subsequent to the Time that the Board returned him?
I dare say his Application was before his Degradation.

The Fact of the Degradation of those Personages was a Matter of Notoriety?
Of course; the Proceedings are quite public.

All Persons acquainted with the State of Things in the Synod of Ulster knew of the Degradation of Two or Three of their Members?
Of course; because in all Cases of Offence, whatever it may be, as regards the Minister, we hold it to be improper to pass a severe Sentence without telling the World as well as the Church the Cause of it.

With respect to any Minister of the Synod of Ulster, it would be rather surprising if he did not know the Fact of a Minister having been degraded?
Of course it would.

It is not to be imagined that Mr. Carlile could be ignorant that those Ministers had been degraded?
It would be strange if he were ignorant.

Will you prepare a List of Applicants, Presbyterian Clergymen, and also Correspondents, Presbyterian Clergymen, against the next Meeting of the Committee; distinguishing Ministers of the Synod of Ulster and those who are not Ministers of the Synod of Ulster?
I have no Objections, except one, that the Names and Addresses are not given with sufficient Accuracy. I am extremely desirous of standing well with my own Countrymen and Neighbours, and it would be a very unpleasant Thing for me were I to attach any thing to an Individual's Name, and find it really belonged to a Person of another Name.

You have no Objection to give the Name, stating that it applies if it was a Person residing in such a Place?
I can have no Objection to that.

You do not know, from looking at that List, whether the Names occurring are really the Names of Persons whom you describe as having been degraded?
Your Lordships will recollect I spoke cautiously, saying, if the Individuals were Persons answering to such an Address.

Do you think it would be unreasonable to extend to Mr. Carlile the same Indulgence you claim for yourself, when you say he must necessarily have known, from the Name of Mr. Gibson, or the Names of other Persons, that they were the Persons who were degraded?
There was a Specialty in the Case there which does not apply to me, because it came as an individual Case; here they are put before me without much Time or Opportunities of examining, which would be afforded to him.

One of the Papers put into your Hands does give a Specialty; opposite to the Name of the Rev. J. A. D. Gibson is put Ballywater St. Andrew's as the Parish, County of Down; is that a sufficient Specification to enable you to know that that was the Mr. Gibson you are speaking of?
I am satisfied it was.

The next is Mr. Love, Temple Meeting House, Derrynose, Armagh; is that a sufficient Specification to enable you to say that that was the Mr. Love who was degraded?
It appears satisfactory.

Will you refer to the other, the Rev. William Skelly, Donaghadee; is that a sufficient Specification to enable you to say that that is the Mr. Skelly who was degraded?
It appears satisfactory to me.

If it is satisfactory to you you would imagine it would be satisfactory to any Minister of the Synod of Ulster, and especially to Mr. Carlile?
It would appear so to me, provided that the Specification which is before me was before him; but I am not aware whether or not this Specification was before him.

You have mentioned Three Persons who have been degraded, Two Ten or Twelve Years ago, and One subsequent to his Connexion with the Board?
I am not aware when his Connexion with the Board commenced.

Do you think, from your Knowledge of the Connexion Mr. Carlile must have had with the Synod of Ulster, he must necessarily have become acquainted with the Names of all Persons who have been degraded, and the Circumstances under which they had been degraded, Twelve Years ago, so that when the Names recurred to him as Correspondents of the Board that should have brought to his Recollection the Circumstances under which they had been so degraded?
I cannot judge for Mr. Carlile, but I can judge for myself; the Matters were of much Notoriety; they came before us, and were inserted in our Minutes, and it would appear to me strange that any Person who was a Member of the Synod should be ignorant of them.

You have been Moderator?
Yes.

When did Mr. Carlile become a Member of the Synod?
I think Twenty Years ago. He has been Moderator also.

Mr. Carlile was resident in Dublin; you have been resident in the North?
Yes.

Do not you conceive Matters which have been notorious to you, and daily brought under your Notice, might have affected you in a Way they would not affect a Gentleman, who, though a Member of the Synod, had ceased to be a resident one?
I do not speak of it as a Matter of Blame; he has a Right to exercise his own

Rev. J. Brown.

own Judgment; but it appears to me strange. If he was not aware of the Fact, provided that your Lordships assume that he was ignorant, I assert that he had an Opportunity of having the Knowledge of it; and it would appear to me strange that he had not.

Are the Minutes transmitted to every Member of the Synod?
Yes; and to every Congregation.

Does Mr. Carlile attend the Synod regularly?
Very generally.

Are those Degradations very frequent in your Church?
No.

How many a Year?
There are Years in which there are no Degradations.

It is rather an extraordinary thing then?
Yes.

The Fact of the Degradation is so extraordinary, that it would naturally fix itself in the Memory of an Individual?
Of course it would. Our Body is so numerous it is not strange that, tried by an austere Standard, there should be such Cases as I have mentioned; our Discipline is very strict.

What is the Proportion of the Number of Ministers of the Synod of Ulster to those of all the other Bodies that call themselves Presbyterians put together?
I should wish to speak on that Subject with great Caution, as I speak from Memory; but I have a tolerably accurate Idea upon that Subject. Our Body has 256 Congregations, and of course more Ministers, as there are a few Collegiate Charges where there are Two Ministers, such as Dublin and Derry; the Secession Body, I should suppose, has about 136 Congregations; the Synod of Munster, I should suppose, from Ten to Twelve; the Remonstrant Body, I should suppose, about Twenty; the Presbytery of Antrim about Ten; we have also a Body called Covenanters, that amount, I should think, to Twenty-five Congregations; a very steady Class of Presbyterians, though not connected with the State.

The Congregations vary in Size, of course?
Of course, very considerably.

The Number of Congregations of Dissenters is no Proof that there is a similar Proportion in the Number of Individuals?
I am quite satisfied that the Body that has the largest Number of Congregations has its Congregations much more numerous in a far greater Proportion connected with them. It is the old Body; the others are but Fractions compared with it.

Your Congregations are much larger, one Congregation with another, than the other Bodies?
On an Average much larger.

Was the Synod of Ulster at first opposed to the Board, or in accordance with it?
At first there was an anxious Desire on the Part of the Synod to meet the Wishes of the Government, and there was an earnest Hope indulged that ultimately the System would be accommodated to their Views; but whenever the Principles were known and avowed the Synod was decidedly opposed to it.

Was there much Political Feeling?
That there may have been Individuals influenced by Political Feeling I have no Doubt whatever; but from my own Knowledge, I should say decidedly it was on Religious Grounds that the Opposition generally was carried on in the Body.

Were you opposed to the Board from the first?
Yes, decidedly; and I believe more constantly than almost any Person connected with it, for there were others who had taken a prominent Part in opposition

Rev. J. Brown.

opposition to it who have appeared to waver. I have never changed my Opinion upon the Subject.

What are your Political Leanings?

Perhaps it may be difficult just to describe them, because I do not in all things agree with any Party I know; but at one Time, and the only Time in which I took any Part in Political Matters, it was when the present Lord Strafford, then Sir John Byng, was a Candidate for the Representation of the County in which I live. I am an Elector of the County, and I availed myself of my Privilege, and not only gave him my Vote but I spoke in his Favour; it was not because I knew him, for I had never seen the Gentleman before. I was convinced that Reform was an important Thing, and I tried to convince the Electors of that County that they ought to support the Individual who came forward on that Interest.

Did any Negotiation take place at any Time between the Synod of Ulster and the Board?

Yes, there did.

Can you state briefly what was the Course of the Negotiation?

The Negotiation did not commence with the Board; it commenced with the Government.

What was the Beginning of the Negotiation with the Government?

So soon as the present Lord Stanley's Letter (he was then Chief Secretary for Ireland) appeared it excited universal Alarm over the North. We very seldom have Special Meetings of the Synod, and it is to be observed that no Moderator has the Right of calling a Meeting of the Synod, unless he has been requested by, I believe, Four Presbyteries to do so; we have taken that special Care to prevent any Moderator acting improperly by bringing us together, and unless he has the Sanction and the direct Request of Four Presbyteries he has no Authority to do it. So soon as Lord Stanley's Letter appeared, Four Presbyteries sent to the Moderator to request him to convene a Meeting; they met at a Time that I can discover if I am permitted to refer to the Minutes; there was a Special Meeting held at a very inconvenient Time of the Year, in Cook's Town, and Resolutions come to upon the Subject; there was a Committee appointed to wait upon the Government, and to make an Effort to have the System modified. Mr. Carlile attended our Meeting, and his Statements, together with the high Respect we felt for him personally (for we all respected him very highly), induced us to entertain a strong Hope that the Matter would be amicably arranged. We passed certain Resolutions, and a Committee was appointed to wait upon Lord Stanley, and to communicate our Views. The Explanation given to us was not satisfactory, and in consequence of that a Deputation waited on Earl Grey and other Members of the existing Government in London; a long Conversation took place with Earl Grey; I was a Member of that Deputation; I never met a more candid or more intelligent Individual in any Rank in Life than Earl Grey; we were met with the most conciliatory Feeling. In consequence of the Communication that then took place, although there was one Circumstance unfortunately that impeded that,—a Communication made by Mr. Carlile, addressed to Earl Grey, stating that we were not authorized, while in fact we were duly authorized, to go upon that Errand,—that Communication was calculated to throw an Obstacle in our Way; but when the Matter was explained, Earl Grey addressed to me a Communication, saying that there was nothing in our Propositions that was disagreeable to the Government; and we did entertain the strongest Hope that the Thing would be adjusted.

Was Mr. Carlile cognizant of the Propositions that were made by you, as deputed by the Synod?

Of course he was, when they came before the Synod itself.

He was present at the Synod when they were passed?

He was present at the Special Meeting in Cook's Town.

Did he take any Part in framing the Propositions?

He entered into a long Conversation, and expressed his Views and gave Hints upon the Subject. He being connected with the Board, of course occu-

Rev. J. Brown.

pied a very difficult and delicate Situation in our Body at that Time. A numerous Deputation waited on Lord Stanley, who gave them a very patient Hearing.

Was this before or after the Communication with my Lord Grey?
It was before the Communication with Lord Grey.

You attended the Meeting at Lord Stanley's also?
I did.

What took place at this previous Meeting at Lord Stanley's?
There was a Discussion that occupied, I think, nearly an Hour, in which we urged upon Lord Stanley the Importance of continuing to us the Privilege we had always enjoyed, of having the Children taught to read the Scriptures during the ordinary School Hours.

Was this in the Year 1832?
I believe it was.

This Book speaks of a Communication about September 1832; should you think that was about the Time?
I believe that was the Time.

Was not this a Twelvemonth nearly before the Communication with Lord Grey?
No; because the Communication took place with Earl Grey, I think, in the following May.

Did the Communication with Lord Stanley terminate favourably to your Views or not?
He requested us to communicate with him in Writing; we committed to him certain Propositions, and on those Propositions he grounded his Letter; he wrote a long Letter. I was Moderator at the Time, and I sent a special Messenger with a Note to him, and requested the Letter might be addressed to Mr. Kirkpatrick of Dublin. The Letter was addressed to him, giving a long Explanation of the Views of Government, and by no means satisfactory to us. In consequence of that it was resolved by the Committee to send a Deputation, I believe in the Month of April or May, to London; and I was one of them, filling at the Time the Situation of Moderator.

The Communication with Lord Grey was very satisfactory?
Very much so.

Was the Conclusion to which the Government came on that Occasion satisfactory?
We had little Experience with great Men and Statesmen. We put the Matter in a plain Light, and we did conceive that every thing was conceded to us. The Language and Manner of Earl Grey were extremely conciliating and agreeable; and I must say for myself that I retired from him with the most perfect Persuasion and Impression on my own Mind that all we sought would be conceded to us.

At that Time more was done by Government to satisfy the Synod than had been done by Lord Stanley the preceding Year?
So we understood it.

Do you mean more was done, or more was said?
Both done and said; but if I am favoured with the Report of 1835, there is an Extract of Earl Grey's Letter which was addressed to myself, and it came to me after I retired from Office.

Did Lord Stanley say that the Propositions which were submitted to him were inconsistent with the Principles upon which the Board was founded?
Although I held in my Possession during several Weeks his Letter, and though I read it with extreme Care, yet I have not had Access to that Document since I came to London, nor during the last Eighteen Months or Two Years; and it would be improper for me to attempt to charge my Memory with a Document so very lengthy; but the general Impression made upon my Mind and upon the Minds of my Brethren was, that he had by no means conceded to us, in that Letter, what we sought.

Rev. J. Brown.

More was conceded to you, as you understood it, in the Communication made by Lord Grey?

Yes; but I should wish to have the whole of the Correspondence before me, before I give an Opinion upon it.

Will you refer to Lord Grey's Letter, now shown to you, and read the Passage?

"I have read with great Attention the Four Resolutions extracted from the Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster, assembled in June and July 1833, and am happy to say I see nothing in them which may not be agreed to as in perfect Accordance with the general Principles on which the new System of Education is founded. I trust therefore that, all Objections being now removed, we may look forward to the full Attainment of those Benefits for which that System was introduced." That is an Extract from Lord Grey's Letter; it was rather a lengthy Communication, and very important.

That was the Conclusion of your Communication with Lord Grey?
It was.

That was the Commencement of your Communication with the Board?
It was.

What took place in the Communications with the Board after that?
I believe the whole of the Communications are here.

You did not come to an Accordance with the Board?
No.

What was the Point on which the Board and the Synod separated?
The great Point was, the Right of reading the Scriptures during the ordinary School Hours.

By "ordinary School Hours" what do you understand?
We have hitherto understood that all the School Hours are ordinary School Hours.

You requested Leave to have the Scriptures read during some Part of those School Hours, and were refused that?
Yes.

Did you mean to enforce the reading of the Scriptures, or only to give Permission to those whose Parents desired it?
Only Permission to those whose Parents desired it; a Freedom we have always enjoyed ourselves. It may be satisfactory to your Lordships to know that in the North of Ireland, and I have been educated in a School in the North of Ireland myself, it has been customary from Time immemorial,—my Father who died an old Man had enjoyed the Privilege, and he told me his Father had enjoyed the Privilege,—it has been the Custom to have a Bible and Testament Class called up and heard in their Turn with the other Classes, and those who chose attended those Classes, and those who did not had no Connexion with them. I was myself taught by a Roman Catholic Teacher in that Way; there was not at that Time the slightest Discontent upon the Subject; there was no Objection; no Division or Dissension; that was a Privilege we enjoyed in early Life.

Did you or not desire to enforce the reading of it on any Roman Catholic Child whose Parents disapproved of it?
No, by no means; one of our Resolutions distinctly disavowed that.

Have the goodness to read that Resolution?
There are Two Resolutions connected with it; the Second Resolution says, "During the first Hour such Children as are so directed by their Parents shall repeat a Portion of the Westminster Catechism, and on Saturdays they shall repeat all they have learned during the Week. 3d. Parents shall be requested to state, when their Children enter School, what Portion of the Day they may consider sufficient for them to employ in reading the Scriptures, and such Arrangements shall be made as shall secure them that Privilege; but no Compulsion whatever shall be employed to induce others to read or to remain during the reading."

Rev. J. Brown.

Did you consider the Board in its first Answer as acceding to your Propositions?
It was not satisfactory.

Did the first Answer give you a Hope that you should succeed?
There was a Hope, but there was something annexed that excited our Alarm; they stated something about Queries. We submitted our Propositions, and it was on those Propositions alone that our Connexion with that Board was to be formed.

They talked about Queries, and that alarmed you?
Yes.

When you came to an Explanation you found the Parties could not agree?
Yes; there were other Points on which we objected, but that was the fundamental Point.

While the Negotiation was going on with the Synod, and before it was brought to a Conclusion, did Mr. Carlile address any Letter to the Members of the Synod of Ulster?
Yes, he did; he addressed a Circular to them all, stating that the Board had acceded to the Propositions of the Synod.

Have you got that Letter?
I believe I have a Copy of it.

"Dear Sir, Office of Education, Merrion Square, 10th Sept. 1833.
"I have the Satisfaction of transmitting to you the following Extract from the Minutes of the Board of Commissioners of National Education, by which you will see that the Board have acceded to the Four Propositions agreed upon by the Synod at its Meeting in June and July last.
"I am yours truly,
"J. CARLILE."

What is the Enclosure?
The Resolution in which the Board say that they have acceded to the Propositions of our Synod; they professed to have done so.

They considered themselves to have acceded?
So they said.

Did you consider yourself, in consequence of what passed with the Board, taking into account that Letter, dealt with unfairly?
We thought it improper, because there was an express Provision made in our Minutes, that so soon as the Arrangement was completed the Moderator should transmit an official Letter to the Moderator of every Presbytery, requesting him to give Notice to his Brethren that the Negotiation had terminated favourably. We thought it therefore an Interference with us for Mr. Carlile to take upon himself the Right of doing that, and particularly when, after the Matter was examined, the Moderator was forced to write in these Terms, by Instruction of the Committee to whom it was intrusted:—"The Moderator was instructed to notify to the Moderators of the respective Presbyteries that the Negotiation of this Committee with the Board of National Education had, for the present, terminated unsatisfactorily; and they then referred the Consideration of the whole Case to the next Synod."

Is Mr. Carlile still a Member of the Synod?
Yes, he is.

Does he enjoy the Confidence of the Synod, as representing them in the Board, and likely to protect the Interest of the Presbyterian Board?
Decidedly not.

You stated that there were Four Propositions made by the Synod?
Yes.

If the Concession you required with regard to reading the Scriptures had been granted, and the other Two or Three Points had been denied, do you think the Synod would have felt disposed to have supported the Board?
I think that they would have felt very reluctant to have given up any one of the

Rev. J. Brown.

the Propositions, but I am quite sure that the most important Point was the reading of the Scriptures.

In the Mode you have described?

Yes. Here are the Four Propositions; they are not very tedious:—"1st, That the Ministers and People of this Church, without the necessary Concurrence of the Ministers or Members of any other Church, should enjoy the Right of applying to the Board of Education for Aid to Schools, accompanied with an Engagement to adhere to them; but in this Proposition we recognize the Right of the Board to consider the Regulations, and decide accordingly. 2d, That it shall be the Right of all Parents to require of Patrons and Managers of Schools to set apart for reading the Holy Scriptures a convenient and sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours, and to direct the Master, or some other Person whom the Parents may appoint and provide, to superintend the reading. 3d, That all Children whose Parents and Guardians so direct shall daily read the Holy Scriptures during the Period appointed, but that no Compulsion whatever be employed to induce others either to read or remain during the reading. 4th, That every Use of Schoolrooms be vested in the local Patrons and Committees, subject in case of Abuse to the Cognizance of the Board."

What did you understand by the Term "stated School Hours"?

All the Hours appointed for the Instruction of the Youth that might assemble.

Do you mean during the Period of united Education?

Decidedly.

Therefore it would not have answered your Purpose to have set apart the first Hour or the last Hour as being a Part of the Hours for united Education?

No, it would not.

Would it have answered your Purpose if some one particular Period of the Hours for united Education were chosen for that Purpose?

We desired just to secure to the Parents the Right of saying how long their Children were to enjoy that Privilege; just the Privilege they had always enjoyed.

Do not you think it might lead to great Confusion if the Parent of each Child were to say what Time the Master should take for reading the Scriptures in the School?

It has been the Practice; we have had the Schools conducted under that Principle. I have Eight under my own Care, and it does not cause the slightest Inconvenience.

Do you mean that if one Parent were to state an Opinion that the Children ought to read the Scriptures Three Hours out of Five, and another that they ought to be read One Hour out of Five, it would be possible, without great Inconvenience, to carry into effect those different Regulations?

But the Parents have a Desire that their Children should be educated; they would not make such an unreasonable Proposal; we know that they are anxious to have the Time of their Children employed to Advantage, and we find from Experience that when the Parents are consulted the whole is regulated in a satisfactory Manner.

What would be the Inconvenience or Objection, supposing the Time necessary for reading the Scriptures be once regulated with the Consent of the Parents, that that Time should be taken either at the Commencement or the End of the regular School Hours, and so understood to be taken?

Your Lordships will recollect I have already stated that I was educated at a School where the Bible and Testament Class were just called up in their Turn; and your Lordships will see that it is utterly impossible that could take place on the Plan which is proposed.

What was the Advantage arising from their all being taken up in that accidental Mode in their Turn?

Not accidental; it was regulated by the Practice of the School.

Rev. J. Brown.

What was the Advantage arising from their being taken up in the Mode regulated by the Practice of the School which would not result from its being the Practice of the School that they should be taken previous to the regular Business of the School or at its Close?

In a divided Population, to bring Children occasionally before or after Hours would be to mark them out as Objects of Observation to the others; and it is in our Opinion very improper that the most important Part of their Education, and that which ought to be made the Foundation of all the rest, should be put into the Background; and that when they have exhausted their Patience, and are eager for their Amusements, they should be then formed into a Bible Class, it puts a Feeling of Unpleasantness into the Mind which we do not wish associated with the Bible. They used to consider it a Privilege, and we wish them still so to consider it.

Should you consider it a Ground of Objection to the Plan, if it was decided that the first Portion of the School Hours, that being such a Portion as should be agreed on, should be appropriated to reading the Scriptures previous to any other Study being commenced?

It is just taking a Liberty no Man has a Right to take, to say there are to be certain Hours during which the Scripture is not to be read. We look upon it a daring and presumptuous Thing for any Class of Men to arrogate to themselves such a Right.

Do you consider that fixing any Time in forming a Course of Education for any particular Study, not being the Study of the Scriptures, is putting away the Study of the Scriptures?

Of course not; but the yielding to a Prohibition to say that there is to be a definite Portion of Time during which the Creatures of God are not to have Access to his Word we consider to be wrong.

Is not the fixing a Time in the Day for any particular Branch of Education, not being the Study of the Scriptures, an Exclusion during that Time of the Study of the Scriptures?

Of course it is, but that is, as a Matter of Arrangement and Convenience, a very different Thing from the Arrangement of the Board.

What would that be but making an Arrangement for the Employment of the School Hours every Day; fixing a Time for the Study of the Scriptures previous to any other Branch of Education being commenced?

So far from being a Matter of Convenience, it would be a Matter of vast Inconvenience that the Children of one Communion should be paraded there for one special Object, and deprived during the other Four Hours of the Right of Access to the Scriptures.

You do not mean that the fixing any Hour for a Branch of Education, not being the Study of the Scriptures, is an Exclusion of the Scriptures during that Hour?

It was a Portion of the Principle on which we negotiated with the Board, to secure to the Parents that Right.

Have you not stated that the Application of any Hour to any Purpose of Education must be an Exclusion of the Scriptures during that Time?

Of course while Persons are studying Arithmetic they cannot be reading the Bible; but what we have sought has been just to obtain the same Freedom for the reading of the Bible for those who wish it as for any other Branch of Education.

Do you mean that the reading of the Bible was to take place during the Period appropriated by the School to any other Branch of Education?

Of course not; our Schools are conducted very easily; if your Lordships would send an Inspector to see the Schools we conduct they would be found to be conducted on the Principles of Common Sense.

Of that the Committee have no Doubt; but what is the Difference you see between fixing certain Hours for any other Branches of Education, not being the Study of the Scriptures, and allowing the Study of the Scriptures in the Way you have described?

We see in the whole Matter and Thing a despotic, and in our Views, speaking

Rev. J. Brown.

speaking with all Submission, an improper and sinful Character; trenching on our Privileges and the Rights we have always enjoyed; depriving us of that which we inherited from our Fathers, and which those who have Children are determined by the Grace of God to give to their Children.

Do you consider any Regulations existing in a particular School, by which particular Hours are assigned to particular Branches of Education, to the Exclusion of all others, as despotic, and essentially interfering with the Object of Religious and other Education?

That Question appears to me so very indefinite that I feel at a loss to give an Answer to it.

You have stated in a former Answer that you considered the Interference proposed by the Board as a despotic Interference; you are now asked whether you consider any Interference by which an Hour is set apart for a particular Branch of Education to be despotic?

If it be taken in the Abstract as a general Question, I should say no; but if put in connexion with the Board I should give a different Answer.

What is the Amount of the Liberty which you claim for the Parents of the Children in respect to their reading the Scriptures; is it not this, that they should be at liberty, at any Period they may choose to fix upon, to call upon the Master, whether in School Hours or not in School Hours, or at what Period of the School Hours, to stop the other Business of the School for the Purpose of having the Scriptures read?

I never dreamed of such a Thing.

Have you ever proposed to the Board that there should be a definite Period fixed at which the Parents of the Children should have the Liberty to have the Scriptures introduced?

We have sought that it shall be the Right of the Parents to direct the Patrons and Managers of the Schools to set apart for the reading of the Scriptures a sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours, and to direct the Master or some other whom the Managers shall provide to superintend the Reading.

Who was to be the Judge of that convenient Period?

Of course the Parents.

Then if they were to have Access at all convenient Periods, and to be the Judges of what were to be convenient Periods, they might fix any Time of the Day they pleased?

It may appear so in Theory, but those who have conducted Schools find no Difficulty in it whatever.

Are not the Schools you speak of Protestant Schools?

No; they are mixed, and often contain many Roman Catholics.

You think that you should not have insisted on the whole you claimed?

What we claimed we insisted on.

Is not the Right you claim now, any Interference with which you consider a despotic Act, to have the Scriptures read at whatever Time in the Day the Parents choose to name for it?

That would be a Matter of Arrangement, of course, between them and the Master and Managers or Patrons.

Do you not claim for the Parents of the Children to name any Portion of the Day which they think proper to have the Scriptures introduced, and to stop any other Business in the School?

Oh no.

Who is to be the Judge?

It is a Matter of Arrangement between the Managers of the School, the Master, and the Parents.

Rev. J. Brown.

Then the Board would have no Right to interfere in the Matter, to see that that was a known Time, so that the Business of the School should not be interrupted?

They would have no Right to say that there was any Portion of the Day during which the Scriptures might not be read.

Then the Consequence is necessary, is it not, that the Business of the School may at any Time of the Day be interrupted at the Desire of the Parents, in order to have the Scriptures read?

No, by no means.

You say "by no means," because it would be a Matter of Arrangement between the Master and the Parents?

Yes; and there is a Second Reason that we know; in point of fact, our Schools are conducted on those Principles without there being any Annoyance of that Kind.

Is not that Arrangement a Violation of the Right of those Persons to read the Word of God at any Time?

I do not understand the Question.

You stated that to exclude the reading of the Scriptures at any particular Hour was a Violation of the Right all Mankind had to have Access to the Scriptures at any Time they liked?

According to our View of it.

You have likewise stated, in answer to the Question just put, that the Consequence of that Right being claimed and conceded would not be, that the Children, or the Parents of the Children, would claim the Right for their Children at any Time of the Day to read the Scriptures, because some Time would be chosen by particular Arrangement between the Parents of the Children and the Masters; did you not say that?

Yes.

Would not then that Arrangement by which the reading the Scriptures was confined to a particular Hour, and excluded from another Hour, be a Violation of that Right which you say all Mankind have to have Access to the Scriptures at any Time they like?

No, not according to my Views.

How is it not a Violation of that Right just as much as a Rule from the Board that the Scriptures shall be read at one Time and not at another?

The Difference is just this: that the Arrangement is made that they may more conveniently enjoy the Right, whereas the other excludes it altogether during certain Hours.

Is not that saying that an Arrangement for that Object is most convenient and desirable always?

It appears to me that it is not, if made by assumed Authority, and not for Convenience.

Do you conceive that if the Hours were neither at the Beginning of the Day nor the End of the Day, but at some Period within the Hours of the Day, that would remove the Objection?

I do not think it would.

Do you believe that the Board or the Patrons of the Schools have a Right, upon your Principles, to fix any particular Hour in the Day for any particular Study, say One Hour, for the Purpose of reading History?

Yes.

Do you believe they have a Right to fix another Hour for Arithmetic?

Of course.

Another Hour for Geography or any thing else?

Yes; but even then the Children might be preparing Lessons in the Bible, if so directed by their Parents.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do you conceive that if Hours were set apart by Regulations for those particular Studies the reading the Scriptures ought to be introduced in those particular Hours?

Of course that would be attended with Inconvenience.

Then can a Part of the Parents be entitled to come in and insist upon their Children reading the Scriptures at any Hour?

The Matter would be arranged by the Parents and the Managers, and it would produce no Inconvenience.

There would be no Objection in your Opinion to the System, provided there was a Power given to the Manager of each School to fix particular Hours in each Day for each particular Study, one of those Studies being the reading the Bible?

To confine it in that Way would be objectionable.

Is it not confined by the Fact of other Branches of Education in other Hours?

But it is confined by the Consent of the Parents, to whom God has given the Charge of educating their Children.

You think it would not be objectionable, if in all Cases it were arranged that the Parents should communicate with the Patrons and the Managers, and settle what should be the Hour at which the Bible should be read?

Yes; and as a Matter of Practice I think the Arrangement would be easily made.

Did you ever propose to the Board any Mode of Arrangement by which you could come to a practical Mode of having the Scriptures read in any seasonable Hours?

Yes, we did.

Had you any written Communication upon that Subject?

Yes, we had.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 20° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Rev. J. Brown.

The Reverend JOHN BROWN is called in, and further examined as follows:

In reference to the Synod of Ulster's Opposition to this System, after the Discussion with the Government and with the Board, was there any thing done at the Meetings of the Synod respecting those Propositions?
Yes, at a Meeting in Derry.

What was done?
There were several Resolutions passed, which I have no Objection to read.

Did they come to any Decision as to the Effect of what had passed between the Board and the Synod?
The Decision of the Synod was against the Board.

In what respect against the Board?
It would be impossible, I believe, to convey an adequate Idea of it without Reference to the Minutes. A Resolution was moved; then another was moved as an amended Motion, which was carried; that of course was the Resolution of the Synod.

When was this?
On the 27th of June 1834.

Have the goodness to read both the original Motion and the Amendment moved upon it?
" Agreeably to the Resolution of a previous Sederunt, that Part of the Minutes of last Year relating to the Subject of National Education was now read, and the Committee appointed to submit certain Propositions to His Majesty's Government, and urge their Adoption, reported their Proceedings during the Year, and read the Correspondence which had taken place between them and the Board of Education. After considerable Discussion, it was moved and agreed to, That this Synod approve of the Conduct of the Committee, entertaining a deep Sense of the Conscientiousness, Ability, and Zeal for the Interests of this Church and the Cause of Scriptural Education which they displayed in their Negotiations with the Board of Commissioners of National Education during the past Year, and do now proceed to the Consideration of the general Question of National Education. It was then moved and seconded, That it is the Opinion of this Synod that the Ministers and People of our Church, if they see fit, may now make Application for Aid out of the Funds for National Education, strictly adhering to the Propositions which were agreed upon at last Meeting of Synod, and which have been subsequently approved by the Government and the Board of Commissioners. To this it was moved and seconded, as an Amendment, First, that ever since the blessed Reformation, in all the common Schools of Evangelical Protestants without Exception, but especially in the Schools of the Church of Scotland, and in those of the Synod of Ulster and in other Presbyterian Bodies in Ireland, Children have enjoyed the free and unrestricted Use of the Holy Scriptures, and have been, until lately, generally accustomed, where their Parents so directed, to learn and read in the sacred Volume; secondly, that the authoritative Exclusion of the Bible from the National Schools during ordinary School Hours seems to have originated, not from any Desire of Protestants, but out of Deference to the Opinions and Objections of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, who have always discovered such Jealousy and Dread of the Sacred Scriptures that wherever they have had the Power they have denied their unrestricted Use to the Laity in general, and to Children in Schools in particular;

Rev. J. Brown.

ticular; and, further, that Experience demonstrates that in whatever Country the Use of the Scriptures has in anywise been restricted the Progress of Protestantism has been proportionably retarded, and the Domination of the Church of Rome extended and confirmed; thirdly, that for the above amongst other Reasons this Synod, as a Witness from the Lord Jesus and the Word of His Truth, did, in the Year 1832-33, most explicitly declare their Disapprobation of the System of National Education, and did earnestly seek to have it reformed; but that, from the Correspondence of our Committee with the Commissioners, and from their Report to the Government, it appears that the original System remains unchanged, and consequently the Reform sought by the Synod still unattained; fourthly, that this Synod therefore now renews its Exhortations to the Ministers and Elders of this Body to refrain from connecting themselves with the Board, and resolves to continue to employ every Means to obtain from His Majesty's Government such a bonâ fide Recognition of our Propositions as will enable our People, without Surrender of Principle, to obtain for their Schools a Portion of the public Funds. After a lengthened Debate, the Synod adjourned at Six o'Clock for One Hour." The same Evening, "The adjourned Debate on the amended Motion was resumed; and after a long Discussion the Roll was called, and the Amendment carried."

Was there a Division?

Yes. There were Fifty-six Ministers and Twenty-five Elders voting for the Amendment, and Sixty-two Ministers and Twelve Elders voting against it.

The Majority of the Ministers were against the Amendment?

At that Time the Majority were against the Amendment; the Majority of Ministers on that Occasion were opposed to the Amendment which was carried by the Elders.

Was Mr. Carlile present at this Meeting of the Synod?

Yes; he spoke upon the Occasion, and it is noticed here: "Against this Decision Mr. Carlile and others protested, and promised to assign their Reasons, in due Time."

Were those Reasons assigned?

Yes, they were.

In the December of that Year did any thing take place?

Yes, there was a Special Meeting of the Synod held at Belfast in December.

What was done?

By that Time a great Number of those who supported Mr. Carlile's Views had changed their Opinion, and as the Matter had excited much unpleasant Feeling it was thought proper on all Parts to form a System of Education of our own, taking the Scotch Parochial School System as a Model, and in this Way to get rid of a Subject that was likely to be a Source of Contention. Many of those Individuals that had been favourable to Mr. Carlile's Views were amongst the most anxious to make that Arrangement; and I say so, my Lords, advisedly, for one Reason, that on the Occasion when the Meeting took place last there had been an Imputation that that Meeting arose from Political Views,—I moved an Amendment to prevent entering upon the Subject at all until a Disclaimer was given that it was not any thing in connexion with Politics that brought them together. I took that Way of obtaining a Denial of the Imputation, and that brought forward the Explanations which followed.

Was there a Division upon that Occasion; did the Resolution to which you came upon that Occasion pass with a Division or unanimously?

In one Sense it may be said to have passed unanimously; but there was a formal Division. The Fact was, that those who carried it were dissatisfied with us for having proposed the Amendment, and to show the Smallness of our Numbers they obliged us to go through the Form of a Division.

After that Amendment was disposed of was the original Motion carried unanimously?

Yes; they entered into it, and all Parties agreed to subscribe for the Support of the Synod's Schools.

Was any Amendment moved at the subsequent Synod?

At a Special Meeting of the Synod in Belfast there was; I have stated that I moved

Rev. J. Brown.

I moved an Amendment purposely to obtain a Disclaimer, lest there should be an Imputation that it proceeded from Political Motives.

Have you got the Resolution that was moved, and the Amendment?
I am not sure whether I have; I know the general Resolutions of the Synod forming the System are here.

This was a Special Meeting; what was the Cause of a Special Meeting being called in December, which is not the usual Month of your meeting?
I have already stated that it arose from a general Feeling that the Subject was uncomfortable and unpleasant, and that we should free ourselves from the ever-changing Theories of Statesmen.

Had there been any disturbed State of the Congregations after the Derry Meeting?
Yes, there was.

Had that disturbed State of the Congregations led to any thing remarkable?
There had been Meetings in several Places, and especially about Ballymena, of a very unpleasant Kind.

A popular Feeling was excited?
Yes, there was; and the Ministers who had taken that view of the Subject were placed in many Instances in very uncomfortable Circumstances.

You say, "who took that view of the Subject;" what view do you refer to?
Mr. Carlile's view.

Did it happen that any Schools were at that Time withdrawn from the National Board, to your Knowledge?
Yes, there were several.

In consequence of the Proceedings of the Synod at Derry?
In consequence of the Agitation that followed the Meeting there.

A great many Schools were in consequence withdrawn from the National Board?
Yes. It may be right to state that it was taken up, and I have no Doubt by many for all manner of Purposes, political and otherwise, and that Individuals not at all connected with our Body took advantage of it; and I felt that so strongly that at a Meeting at Coleraine I defended my Brethren who had favoured Mr. Carlile's views. At a Meeting of the Hibernian School Society there was an Imputation cast upon those Brethren who had supported Mr. Carlile's views, and I felt it my Duty to rise in my Place to state that I believed there were honest and conscientious Men who valued the Bible who supported his views; but many of those who had supported the original Motion, that in support of a Connexion with the Board, afterwards changed their views.

Do you mean those Ministers?
Yes.

In point of fact did the Synod take any Step whatever?
In 1835 the Synod determined not to enter upon it. They were forced to exercise Discipline on some of their own Members who had gone too far, as they supposed, in encouraging that Agitation. They did proceed to exercise Discipline towards Mr. M'Clelland and others, who had tried to excite the popular Feeling against the Education Board.

Was he a Minister?
Yes. He had travelled over the Country in a Way we did not approve of.

And you censured him accordingly?
We did.

Was there any thing further; Suspension, or any thing of that Kind?
There was Suspension.

For what Period?
I am not aware of the Period for which it lasted; he was suspended till the Presbytery should see Evidence of his Repentance.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do you happen to know whether he has been restored?
Yes, he has been restored.

In 1836 was any thing done by the Synod respecting the Board?
Yes; they came to a Resolution to recommend to all their Ministers to support our own System.

At what Time in 1836 was it?
At an adjourned Meeting in Belfast on the 15th of September in 1836. There had been previous Notice given in the preceding Year of a Motion. The Resolution is in these Terms: "That inasmuch as this Synod has unanimously agreed to establish a System of Scriptural Education upon Presbyterian Principles, and inasmuch as it has repeatedly lifted up a Testimony against the new System of National Education, which Testimony it has now reiterated in the Statement, that "its Mind on the Subject remains unchanged," it shall be most earnestly recommended to the Ministers, Elders, and People of this Body, that for the Purpose of advancing the Interests of Religion and securing the Peace of their Body none of them shall in future remain Patron or Correspondent for any School under the new Board, or be in any way connected with that System."

Did that Resolution pass?
It did.

With a Division or Vote?
With a Division.

What were the Numbers?
"This Motion having been seconded, after some Discussion the previous Question was moved and seconded as an Amendment. Then, Thursday September 15th, 1836, the Minutes of the last Sederunt were read. The Debate upon the previous Question was resumed; and after a protracted Discussion, the Roll was called, and the previous Question negatived; Thirty-four Ministers and Two Elders voting against, and Five Ministers and Two Elders for it. The original Motion having been then put, after some Discussion the Roll was again called, and it carried; Twenty-seven Ministers and Three Elders voting for, and One Minister and One Elder voting against it."

Since that Resolution have any Members who were before in Connexion with the Board, so far as you know, abandoned their Connexion with it?
I should suppose there have. I am aware that some Individuals have told myself that their Views were changed; that they had supported the Board at Derry, having come under the Impression that the Proposals of the Synod had been granted, but that they were now convinced of the contrary; and that on general Principles, after a more minute and mature Examination, they were determined to support the Synod's System. Our present Moderator is of that Opinion.

Was he a Supporter of the Board at the Synod at Derry?
He did support it by his Vote.

Did he support it at the last Meeting at Belfast?
He had no Opportunity, because he was Moderator.

What is his Name?
Mr. Rogers. It is only when there is an Equality of Votes the Moderator gives a casting Vote.

Is the System of the Board more or less popular now among the Members of your Synod and your Congregations than it was in former Years?
Much less popular. There was a general Impression prevalent, that it would be in some Way or other modified to meet our Views; that having failed, the Impression against it is deepened, particularly from several Cases which have occurred. One Thing that opened the Eyes of the Friends of the System was the Conduct observed in the Case of the Ballyhooly School, conducted by Mr. Killin, the Minister of Raphoe, who connected himself with the Board.

The Presbyterian Minister?
Yes, a Minister of the Synod of Ulster; a young Man of high Talent and

of

Rev. J. Brown.

of high Character; he proceeded upon the Principles of the Synod's Four Propositions; he answered certain Queries, and on those Answers he formed his Connexion with the Board; after some Time there was an Interference.

An Interference on the Part of whom?

There was an Interference with him in consequence of an Application made to the Board; I believe by a Roman Catholic Clergyman in the Neighbourhood.

When you say an Interference, by whom did you mean that the Interference was made?

By the Board. There was an Interference with the Arrangements he had made.

Do you know this of your own Knowledge?

Yes. The Matter has attained great Notoriety; and I have conversed with Mr. Killin on the Subject.

Upon the whole, from your long Experience of the State of Feeling and the Religious Opinions of the Presbyterian Body belonging to the Synod of Ulster, will you state whether you think the Board System is calculated to succeed amongst them or not?

I think decidedly not.

Will you state why you hold that Opinion?

From my own Observation and Acquaintance with the People who had displayed the strongest Attachment to Education.

Do you think that, upon Presbyterian Principles, Resistance to the Board is necessary?

Yes, so long as the Board remains constituted in the present Way, and so long as it acts in its present Manner.

What do you mean by "constituted in the present Way"?

So long as it has Individuals that will say they accede to the Propositions that we submitted to them, and refuse to us the Right of telling them the Sense in which we understand those Propositions ourselves. They put an Interpretation on our Language, and refuse to allow us to interpret our own Meaning. Now we do feel that so long as Gentlemen connected with that Board treat us in that Way it is not likely that we can come to an Arrangement.

What do you mean by their refusing to you the Right to interpret your own Meaning?

We submitted certain Propositions; they said to us in their Communication that they admitted those Propositions, that they conceded them; when we applied to them on those Principles they told us directly again in Practice that there were certain Hours during which the Scriptures could not be read.

Had the Objection to your Right of making Application simply by stating their Rules, without answering any Query Sheet, any Weight with the Synod?

Yes, it had considerable Weight.

Was that one of the respects in which you conceived you were unfairly dealt by?

It was so.

Did you in fact know of any Instances in which Applications were tendered to the Board stating the Principle on which the School was intended to be carried on, and rejected by the Board, unless the Query Sheet, being sent to the Applicants, was answered by them?

Yes, I have known Instances of that Nature; Ministers who have tried it again and again in that Way have told me they were disappointed.

You have stated the Ground on which you think Resistance by Presbyterians may be necessary; will you state what there is in the System itself, or in the Operation of that System, which makes you think such Resistance necessary?

First and chiefly, the Contest is the Demand on the Part of the Board from us that there must be Four Hours during which the Scriptures are not admissible.

Rev. J. Brown.

Where do you find any Demand from the Board that there shall be Four Hours during which the Scriptures shall not be admissible?

We find that in the Instructions given to their Inspectors.

Have the goodness to specify the Instruction?

I state that as a Matter of practical Experience. I had a Trial of the Kind myself, and I put it to the Inspector, Dr. Finn, a respectable Man, whether he was instructed on that Subject, and he distinctly told me that during Four Hours the Scriptures were not admissible.

Is it merely from what Dr. Finn stated to you that you judge that the Board have decided that during Four Hours the Scriptures are excluded?

Though it is a considerable Time since I read the Regulations, I so understood them.

You say you object to the System of the Board; first, because they have retracted their Accession to the Propositions of the Synod, and next, because they had directed that during Four Hours the Scriptures shall be excluded; will you point out any Part of the Regulations of the Board by which that is insisted on?

I have understood that they have been changed, so that a Person requires to know the Date; but it surprises me that there should be a Doubt upon that Subject, whether the Scriptures are admissible during the whole of the School Hours.

With reference to the Board having retracted their Accession to the Four Propositions of the Synod of Ulster?

I believe it would be more correct to say, that they never in fact meant it; they said so in Words, but in fact they never in my Opinion granted the Propositions of the Synod.

Will you refer to the Instructions to the Inspectors now shown to you, and state whether there is any thing in those Instructions by which the Board precluded the Use of the Scriptures for Four Hours?

The Instructions are so lengthy that I would not be prepared to give an Opinion just at once upon them; but here it is I think, "As the Holy Scripture is itself unhappily a Subject of Controversy in this Country, both in regard to the Books which constitute Scripture and to the Translation of it, and as the Introduction of the Bible into Schools for common Education has created much Contention and Dispute, and prevented a very large Proportion of the poorer Classes of Ireland from sending their Children to Schools receiving Government Aid, it is not to be introduced during the Hours set apart for common Education." There is the Prohibition.

That is a Proposition which you say excluded the Scriptures during Four Hours of the ordinary School Hours?

Yes.

When you say Four Hours, on what do you found the Reference to that particular Space of Time?

I found it on the Interpretation given by the Inspector himself, and by all Individuals that ever I have conversed with.

Have the goodness to take this Copy of the Instructions now shown to you, and read the Passage pointed out to you?

"In all Schools aided by the Commissioners certain Days, at least Four, and certain Hours, at least Four in each Day, are understood to be set apart for Moral and Literary Education, during which Children of all Denominations are to be educated together; during these Hours no Book inculcating or countenancing peculiar views of Religion is to be used. As the Holy Scripture is itself unhappily a Subject of Controversy in this Country, both in regard to the Books which constitute Scripture and to the Translation of it, and as the Introduction of the Bible into Schools for common Education has created much Contention and Dispute, and prevented a very large Proportion of the poorer Classes of Ireland from sending their Children to Schools receiving Government Aid, it is not to be introduced during these Hours set apart for common Education, but every Facility is to be given for the reading and explaining of the Scriptures either before or after these Hours." I trust I have satisfied your Lordships

Rev. J. Brown.

Lordships that my Recollection was correct, although the Period was distant, for happily when I saw the Character of the Thing I determined not to tease myself much with it; I saw in it one Principle which convinced me that it was bad, and I determined to keep my Hands clear of it.

Have you Reason to believe that the Board would have refused, if Application had been made by the Parents of the Children in any particular School, to have a definite Portion of the School Hours set apart for Instruction in the Bible?

Yes; and my Reason is, the Treatment of Mr. Killin in Ballyhooly School; there is a public Document stating that, and here is Mr. Carlile's Defence of the Board.

With reference to your Evidence on Friday, is not that which you require, and the Violation of which you say would be an Act of Despotism, that the Parents shall be at liberty at any Time, in any Portion of the Day, whether in School Hours or not, to have the Scriptures introduced?

It appears to me strange that the Regulations of the School should extend beyond the School Hours; that I do not understand; but I will explain at once what we wish.

With reference to your Evidence on Friday, is not that which you require, and the Violation of which you say would be an Act of Despotism, that the Parents shall be at liberty at any Time, in any Portion of the Day, whether in School Hours or not, to have the Scriptures introduced?

I may be of very obtuse Understanding, but I cannot see how the Regulations of the School can extend beyond the School Hours.

Do you mean to say you do not understand the Question?

I beg to state that unless it be divided into Two Parts I feel at a loss to give an Answer, but I feel at no loss to give an Explanation which I apprehend would be satisfactory.

You stated that you consider it essential to Religious Liberty that the Parents shall have the Right to introduce the Scripture at any Time they think proper?

Certainly; in this Sense, that they shall have the Right of saying to the Master, we wish our Children to be taught to read the Scriptures, but not to interfere with the Rights of others; that they shall send a Bible or a Testament, and all the Bible or Testament Classes shall take their Turn with the other Classes, and the Child may be instructed to attend to a Lesson in Arithmetic or Reading besides; of course during that Time it would not be reading the Bible, but when not employed on other Lessons it would take the Bible to its Bench or Form, and be reading over its Lesson, and preparing for reading it; that is just what we have been accustomed to have, and which we now seek to continue to the Children of our Persuasion.

You are understood to say that you conceive the Exclusion of the Sacred Writings at any Time or for any Period is a Violation of Scripture Rights and a Despotism which, with the Grace of God, you will never submit to?

I am still of that Opinion, with the Explanation I have given.

Are you to be understood, that your Objection is, that a Roman Catholic is, according to the Rules of the Board, permitted to require an Exclusion of the Bible as a Reading Book for those Children whose Parents wish them to use it as a Reading Book, as their Reading Lessons during the ordinary School Hours?

Yes; and that in opposition to those Propositions which they said they conceded.

The first Application which the Synod made to the Board was the 24th of August 1833, was it not?

Yes.

That is in these Terms: "I have been instructed by the Committee appointed at the last Meeting of the General Synod of Ulster for corresponding with Government to submit to the Board of Education the following Propositions: Resolved, 1st, That the Ministers and People of this Church,

Rev. J. Brown.

without the necessary Concurrence of the Ministers or Members of any other Church, shall enjoy the Right of applying to the Board of Education for Aid to Schools, accompanied with an Engagement to adhere to them. But in this Proposition we recognize the Right of the Board to consider the Regulations and decide accordingly." Do you consider that the Board have violated that first Proposition?

Yes. We sought to be free from the Necessity of seeking the Concurrence of the Ministers or Members of other Churches; and we felt that it was deviated from; there was a Preference given to those who were so connected.

That the Board refused you the Right of applying for Aid to your Schools without the Concurrence of the Ministers or Members of any other Church, which is all that was asked by this First Resolution?

As to the general working of the Board, I remain happily very much in ignorance of it; from the Time I saw those first Principles I was determined to do so.

What did you find in the Practice of the Board inconsistent with a Compliance with this First Resolution, whereby you require that you may be at liberty to apply to the Board for Aid to the Schools without the Ministers or Members of any other Church being joined with you; has that been violated?

Yes, it appears so. If your Lordships direct your Attention to a subsequent Letter you will see what the Committee of the Synod say upon that Subject. It is in the 36th Page, dated the 18th of February 1834. Here is the Committee's Objection: "The Synod requires, in Proposition First, that their Ministers and People should have the Right of applying for Aid by a Statement of the Constitution and Regulation of the Schools, accompanied with an Engagement to adhere to them. In addition to this the Board demands an Answer to Queries, thereby annexing a new Condition, annulling the Synod's Right of applying by a Statement, &c., and rendering the Propositions perfectly nugatory."

Have the Board departed from their original Agreement, which has been communicated to the Synod of Ulster? You are now referring to a subsequent Resolution of the Synod?

I have endeavoured to show your Lordships the Ground on which we acted in the Matter, because I and my Brethren were of opinion that that was not conceded in reality, while it was so in name.

On what Ground did you say that this Board as it is constituted cannot have your Concurrence, inasmuch as they have broken Faith with you, and departed from their original Concessions?

It would be more correct to say that they really never granted them; that is my view of it.

The Second Proposition you make is this: "That it shall be the Right of all Parents to require of Patrons and Managers of Schools to set apart for reading the Holy Scriptures a convenient and sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours, and to direct the Master or some other Person whom the Parents may appoint and provide to superintend the reading." Have you ever applied on the Part of any School, or on the Part of the Synod, to have a definite Portion of the School Hours set apart for reading the Scriptures, and been refused?

Yes; I believe there have been many Instances of Applications of that Sort made and refused; the Brown Street School in Belfast for example.

From what Documents do you state that; is it from your own Knowledge?

There is a lengthened Account of the Proceeding of that School; it excited very considerable Interest in the North of Ireland.

Do you live at Belfast?

I do not; but I have had it from the Persons who live in that District, and from published Documents.

The Third is, "That all Children whose Parents and Guardians so direct shall read the Holy Scriptures during the Period appointed; but that no Compulsion whatever be employed to induce others either to read or remain during the

Rev. J. Brown.

the reading: Fourth, That every Use of Schoolrooms be vested in the local Patrons, of Committees, subject, in case of Abuse, to the Cognizance of the Board." Will you direct your Attention to the Answer the Board has given to those Four Propositions by their Letter of the 6th of September 1833, signed by the Secretary of the Board: "I have the Honour to acknowledge the Receipt, upon the 27th Ultimo, of your Letter of the 24th August, in which, by the Instruction of your corresponding Committee, you submit to the Board of Education the Four Propositions abstracted from the Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster assembled in June and July 1833, which were adopted relative to the Board, and also an Extract of Earl Grey's Reply in reference to these Propositions?" It then recites the Propositions; and then the Answer of the Board is this: "The Commissioners having had this Letter submitted to them, desire me to state, that having previously to the Receipt of it made the Minute of the 26th of August with reference to the Four Propositions extracted from the Minute of the General Synod assembled in June and July 1833, and which Minute of the 26th August I had the Honour of transmitting to you on the 27th Instant, by the Direction of the Commissioners, they now desire me to refer you to it, and to add that all Applications for Aid which may be made to them by Members of your Church, founded upon the Principles of these Four Propositions of the General Synod, would, like all Applications proceeding from other Individuals, be dealt with by them separately according to the Circumstances of each." Was that the Answer you received?

Yes.

Did they refuse to deal with you separately, according to your Application, for any individual School?

No, certainly not; they have not refused to deal separately, but they have refused to do what we sought; they have refused to us the Privilege of having the Scriptures used in the Schools during Four Hours, and they have refused us the Right of Schoolrooms for the Purpose for which we have applied for them.

Did you consider then this Letter which has been just read, dated the 6th of September 1833, as implying a Refusal of the Demands which were made in those Propositions?

Certainly, we did.

Was that founded upon their declining to give you a direct Answer to your Application?

Yes, but still more from their Conduct; as, for example, their Conduct towards Mr. Killin.

Was it also from a general Impression of the dealing with Cases?

Yes, that increased the Impression.

There was that general Feeling that Cases were so dealt with?

Yes.

Will you attend to the Communication of the 27th of August 1833, which is referred to in the Letter of the 6th of September 1833: "The Commissioners of Education having had submitted to them by His Majesty's Government the Four Propositions extracted from the Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster assembled in June and July 1833, for their Consideration, direct me to have the Honour of informing you, that they are of opinion that those Propositions do not contain any thing inconsistent with the Principles of the System of Education committed to their Charge. His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant having expressed his Approbation, they will receive Applications from the Patrons of the Schools in conformity with them; and grant Aid, upon having such Queries as they shall deem necessary to put satisfactorily answered. The Commissioners further direct me to have the Honour of requesting you to communicate the Subject Matter of this Letter to your Brethren of the Synod in whatever Manner may appear to you to be most fitting and judicious." They in this agree to receive the Applications by the Schools for Grants of Aid, on having such Queries as they shall think necessary to put satisfactorily answered. Do you conceive that in requiring the Queries they

Rev. J. Brown.

think it necessary to put to be satisfactorily answered they are departing from that which they had laid down in their Answer?

We have had Experience that in the Way in which they interpret those Queries they deprive us of what we sought and negotiated for; that was our Impression.

Will you refer to the Letter of the Moderator of the Synod to the Board, of the 8th of November 1833: "The Committee of the Synod having obtained from Government an Approval of the Modifications of that System contained in those Propositions, and also a similar Approval from the Board of Education, upon certain Queries being answered satisfactorily, and seeing in the printed Query Sheet that there is no Query which may not in their Opinion be answered satisfactorily without departing from those Propositions; and considering that in consequence of such Approval of our Propositions we are bound solely by the Constitution and Regulations of our Schools, as they may be set forth in our Applications for Aid, and not by the printed Regulations and Directions of the Board, in which there are several Matters which appear to be incompatible with the Spirit and Meaning of our Propositions; it is the Opinion of this Committee that the Ministers and People of the General Synod of Ulster, if they see fit, may now make Application for Aid out of the Funds for National Education, strictly adhering to the Propositions agreed upon by the Synod and approved of by the Government and the Board?" Do you consider that those Queries that have been stated in this Letter, containing nothing inconsistent with your Propositions, those Queries being put, warrant you in saying that the Board had departed from their Agreement with you?

What we blame them for is that they do not give us the Privilege of adhering to our own Statement.

You have stated that you object to the Query Sheet as a Departure from the original Propositions agreed to; what is there in that Query Sheet inconsistent with those Propositions?

The Statement that I made was, that the putting those Queries to us, and not giving us the Privilege of adhering to our Statement, but adding something beyond that, appeared to us inconsistent with the Spirit and Meaning and Intention of our Propositions.

Then are the Committee to understand that you do not mean to say that there is any thing in the Query Sheet which warrants you in saying that the Board have broken Faith with you, or departed from their original Contract?

I do not think that the Query Sheet is a Departure, as it strikes me at this Moment; but we had sought that we should have the Right of making an Application without the Concurrence of others, and the annexing the Queries seems to be attaching a new Condition.

Do you consider this Query Sheet, and the Demand of Answers to the Queries contained in it, as a Departure from the original Answer of the Board, or not?

What we understood was, that we were to make a Statement of the Rules of our Schools, and to be bound by that; and the putting new Queries was a Departure from the original Test.

Do you consider the Query Sheet to be a Departure from the original Test?

It appears to me attaching a Condition which was unnecessary.

The Question is, not whether it was necessary or unnecessary, but whether it was a Breach of the Contract; was the requiring an Answer to the Query Sheet a Departure from the Contract which had been entered into on the Part of the Board?

As a Matter of Form, probably it is not; but as to the Spirit of it, we were to be bound by the Engagement we had entered into, and no Addition should be made to that Engagement.

You are here justifying your necessary Opposition to the Board upon the distinct Ground that they have broken Faith with you and departed from their Contract;

Rev. J. Brown.

Contract; and you mentioned, as a Proof of that, that the requiring an Answer to the Query Sheet justifies your Opposition; do you now say that the requiring an Answer to the Query Sheet is a Departure by the Board from their Contract so as to justify that Opposition?

I have said that in point of Form it does not appear to me to be so, but in Practice that it is; we understood that when an Engagement was entered into, when we stated the Constitution of the School, that was to be final.

Do you persist in saying that by using this Query Sheet the Board have substantially broken their Contract with you, or not?

I do consider that in the Spirit of it it is a Violation.

You think that substantially they have broken their Contract with you?

Yes; or rather that they only made a Contract in Words.

Will you direct your Attention to a Letter of the Synod of the 8th of November 1833:—"Seeing in the printed Query Sheet that there is no Query which may not in their Opinion be answered satisfactorily without departing from those Propositions, and considering that in consequence of such Approval of our Propositions we are bound solely by the Constitution and Regulations of our Schools, we consider that we are at liberty to apply to the Board for Assistance." The Synod have here stated that there is no Query which may not in their Opinion be answered satisfactorily without departing from those Propositions?

They sought just to abide by that, and they complain that that has not been done to them.

Are you still of opinion that there is nothing requiring an Answer in that Query Sheet which is inconsistent with your former Propositions?

If the Statement made there is to be final I am satisfied that according to my Views it would be agreeable to our Body.

Will you refer to the Letter of the 18th of February 1834, in which you state your Objections to the Proceedings of the Board:—"The Synod requires, in Proposition 1st, that their Ministers and People should have the Right of applying for Aid by a Statement of the Constitution and Regulations of the Schools, accompanied with an Engagement to adhere to them. In addition to this, the Board demands an Answer to Queries, thereby annexing a new Condition annulling the Synod's Right of applying by a Statement, &c., and rendering the Propositions perfectly nugatory?" You say that the Board have departed from their original Engagement by annexing a new Condition; you assent to the Propriety of answering those Queries, as being no Departure from the Propositions, and now you say that they have made a new Condition by requiring an Answer to those Queries; can you reconcile those Two Statements?

I do not admit the alleged Contradiction; but while I admit that I have not lately attended much to the Subject, I am ready to explain and to defend both Statements in the Connexion in which they were placed.

This Letter is signed by the Moderator of the Synod of Ulster, Mr. Finlay, who wrote officially at the Time?

Yes.

The Question is, whether the Synod of Ulster must necessarily be opposed to the System of the Board; and one of the Grounds on which you say they must necessarily be opposed to it is the Board having broken Faith with them?

The strong Ground I always put foremost is the reading of the Scriptures; and I give that as the Opinion of the Synod.

How do you reconcile the Opinion of the Synod expressed in the first of those Documents with the Letter of one of them, that the Board has broken Faith with them, and not they with the Board?

I have already shown the great Point that the Synod have sought,—the Freedom of the Scriptures,—which they have not obtained.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do you wish to give any Explanation of what you said as to your believing that the Board had misconceived your Propositions?

With respect to the reading of the Scriptures; I was interrupted when I stated that we thought we had secured to the People of our Persuasion the Right of having their Children taught during the whole of the stated School Hours to read the Scriptures, and we found by the Instructions given by the Board that there were Four Hours during which the Scriptures could not be read.

You thought you had attained one Thing, and the Regulations of the Board established another?

Yes; and we thought it strange that they referred us to former Notes, and broke off the Correspondence. We wished a full Explanation on a Subject of so much Importance.

Do you consider that the Board are the Persons answerable for having broken off the Correspondence, and that there has been no Intimation on your Part that it would be desirable not to continue the Correspondence any further?

We sought the Explanation.

In the first Document of 18th February 1834 do you not find this Passage, after stating your Objections: "In conclusion, the Committee of Synod, feeling that it is more than Time that this Correspondence should close, entreat most respectfully that the Board will be pleased to favour them with a categorical Reply to the following Queries." Is that Passage contained in the Letter of the Moderator of the 18th of February 1834?

Yes, it is; and this Committee was intrusted by the Synod with full Power to treat with the Board on an important Subject; they were not to be tied down by a few Expressions, but to look to their own Propositions, and to have them secured to the People. That Correspondence was broken off, I think I am entitled to say, by the Letter of the 21st of February 1834.

In this Letter of the 18th of February 1834 the Committee say, that "it is more than Time that this Correspondence should close;" do not you consider that on the Part of the Synod as expressing a Desire that there should be either a categorical Answer made to the Propositions, or no further Communication?

Yes; they felt that if there was no Satisfaction upon those Points, it was worse than useless; the Meetings were not pleasing to us, brought together from all Parts of the Province.

In answer to this, in which you say it is more than Time that this Correspondence should close, the Secretary of the Board says in the Answer of the 21st of February, "I have the Honour of receiving your Letter of the 18th Instant, and having laid it before the Commissioners of Education, they direct me, in answer, to refer you to their Minute of the 26th August last, which I transmitted to you on the 27th of that Month; and to state, that as their Views upon the Matter of your Letter are fully expressed in it they decline further Correspondence on the Subject"?

And they add further, "They further direct me to observe that they must decide upon the Applications of Members of your Body as they do upon those of all others, according to the Merits of each Case and the Principles of the Regulations under which they act." Where then was our Statement? I think that will explain what has been referred to so often in the former Observations.

They said in their original Letter that they would be governed by their Regulations, and their Regulations were conceived by you not to be inconsistent with your own Regulations?

We discovered, or thought we discovered, that they were inconsistent with our Right of applying by making a Statement, and being bound by that alone.

When the Synod of Ulster was first consulted upon the Propositions of the Board, when the Propositions were first discussed, a Majority of the Clerical Members

Rev. J. Brown.

Members of the Synod were in favour of holding Communication with the Board?

Yes, certainly; entering into a Negotiation with them.

And bringing their Schools under the Sanction of the Board?

That depends upon the Date.

At the Date you have been referring to, of the Derry Meeting?

Yes, that appears to be the Fact as to the Majority at that Time.

The Majority of the Clerical Members of the Synod being of that Opinion, the Lay Members of the Synod were called to the Consultation?

They were not called in; they had as good a Right to be there as we had.

The Numbers were taken first of the Clerical Members independent of the Lay Members; there was a Majority of the Clerical Members for entering into conjunction with the Board?

Yes, there was.

Then the Thing was postponed to another Day?

No; the same Day and Hour.

Some of the Lay Members had voted upon the First Resolution with the Clerical Members?

Your Lordships know when there is an Amendment that must be put first, and I read correctly from the Minutes the Motion as put.

There were Fifty-six Ministers and Twenty-five Elders for the Amendment, and there were Sixty-two Ministers and Twelve Elders against it; was there any particular Reason for applying to the Elders on this Occasion?

The Elders had as good a Right to give their Opinion; and several of them spoke with Energy and Eloquence on the Occasion on both Sides.

Have you any Recollection particularly who the Elders were; you say there was nothing of a Political Character in this, but that it was decided on Religious Grounds?

I have not made that Statement. I think with reference to that the Question refers to the Special Meeting at Belfast, and the other to the Meeting at Derry.

Did Politics mix themselves with the Meeting in Derry?

So far as I know there was little Political Bias displayed; of course every Individual carried his personal Feelings there, as he would into another Place.

Do you remember who the Elders were who took a Part in that first Meeting in Derry?

I remember some of them that were there very well; one Man of the Name of John Killoch, a plain Countryman.

Were any of them strong Political Characters?

Not that I recollect. None that I recollect were particularly distinguished for Political Feeling; the Man that I refer to I know was not.

Did any of them belong to Political Associations?

Not that I am aware of; with respect to Killoch I can say with Certainty he did not.

A Change took place in the Opinions of the Clerical Members of the Board after that Meeting in Derry?

On the Part of many.

Do you believe that very considerable Exertions had been used with a view to producing that Change?

I have already stated that there were Individuals that excited some Agitation, and I have stated that the Synod applied its Discipline to some of them.

What was the particular Agitation you allude to on the Part of that Individual?

It was heading a Procession of Persons who went into Ballymena; that excited considerable Attention at the Time.

Rev. J. Brown.

Were the Persons not known by any Political Name?

No, they were not known by any Political Name. They assumed a very extraordinary Appearance; they all marched with Bibles under their Arms.

They had been led to believe that the Object or Effect of the Board would be to deprive them of the Use of their Bible?

Yes; and to deprive their Children of the free Use of it in Schools.

Under this Impression they acted in a violent Manner?

No, I do not believe there was much Violence on their Part; they marched in a very foolish Manner into the Town, but I recollect no Violence.

In such a Manner as to induce you to believe that the Person who was instrumental in that ought to be suspended?

Yes; we thought it unbecoming in a Presbyterian Minister to lead them in that Way.

Do you think that the Ministers of the Presbyterian Body were alarmed at the Idea that their temporal Interests were endangered by their Connexion with the Board?

I do not know how to give an Opinion upon that Subject; I think they are Men of those independent Feelings they are not likely to be biassed in that Way; they might have felt their Usefulness endangered by acting in opposition to the Feelings of the People. I have no Doubt their own Minds were influenced chiefly by the Difficulties which arose; that they felt they had not been dealt with very fairly; they had by Negotiation, as they conceived, obtained the Right of reading the Scriptures; that was the Impression made upon their Minds; and the Conduct observed in respect of the Brown Street and Ballyhooly Schools opened the Eyes of the People, and led many of them to a different Opinion. Various Circumstances of this Kind had their Influence, and no Doubt some felt a regard to temporal Interests; but this Feeling I believe had no extensive Influence.

Have you any Ground to know that if a Proposition had been made for any particular School to the Board, stating that the Parents of the Children of that School had agreed that a definite Period should be fixed for reading the Scriptures during the School Hours, the Board would not have complied with that?

I have heard Ministers say that they had applied for Schools, just giving a Description of what has been the ordinary Practice in Presbyterian Districts, and were disappointed.

Do you know of any Instance of such an Application?

I cannot state the Names; but I have heard that stated in such a Way that I do not at all doubt its Truth.

Do you know of any Persons who made Applications to the Board who stated that the Parents had desired that during a definite Portion of the School Hours the Scriptures should be read, and that that was refused?

No, for this Reason, the Persons always made such a Statement as would show what was our Practice, and that always proved that the Bible itself just took its Turn with other Books; and they could not of course seek for a limited Time, in your Lordship's Sense of it.

The Point of Dissent, and the Point on which in truth you finally came to a Variance with the Board was, that you desired that in any Hour in every Day, whether during School Hours or not, the Bible might be introduced, and the Business of the School interrupted?

No; that is not the State of the Case; I have already explained it as a great many others understood it, that the Bible is to be there, and that the Readers of it are to have their Turn with those attending to other Studies.

Can you refer the Committee to any Institution for the Instruction of Youth, whether Universities or Academies, where such a Privilege has been granted, and where the Parents of any Children have required it?

Of course not; and our Parents do not so require it. But I have already shown that what we seek would not interrupt the Instruction; it would be a Matter of Arrangement.

Rev. J. Brown.

You think that as Matter of Arrangement, by the Desire of the Parents, the Bible may be prohibited at a certain Period?
Not prohibited, but arranged for the Convenience of all concerned, that they may read it with greater Advantage.

Do you not consider that a Violation of Christian Faith or an Act of Despotism on the Part of those who so arrange?
No, on the contrary; that the Persons would retire to their Bible from other Studies, and would be reading it while other Lessons were going on.

That Arrangement being made between the Parents and the Conductor of the School, the Minister, the Committee, and the Schoolmaster?
Yes, that is done every Day with us.

That is a common Practice in the Part of the Country from which you come?
Yes, it is.

Can Two or Three Classes be taught, either by the Monitor of the Class or the Schoolmaster, different Branches of Learning at the same Time in the same School?
Yes, there may be different Branches attended to at the same Time.

A Class may be taught in the Bible and a Class taught in Spelling at different Parts of the Schoolroom?
Yes.

They stand in Semicircles, with their Faces to the Wall?
Yes.

Could you conscientiously as a Presbyterian Minister encourage the Children under your Direction in reading the Scripture Lessons as a Part of their general Instruction?
There are many Parts of the Scripture Lessons to which I should have no Objection, provided the Children reading them had Access to the whole Scripture, but at the same Time I feel a decided Objection to the Scripture Lessons. I may be permitted to add, that I gave them a Reading soon after the Appearance of them; I have not for a considerable Time attended to them, but at the Time I formed a decided Opinion against them.

Against them in such a Sense that you would find it your Duty as a Minister of the Presbyterian Church to dissuade your Children from reading them?
Yes; especially when accompanied with the Prohibition to read the Scriptures for Four Hours.

Can you mention any specific Objection you have to any one Book?
I have an Objection to the Note which represents the Saviour, according to my view of it, as subject to the Virgin Mary.

What Note is that?
It is a Note taken from the Douay Version.

On what Passage?
It is near the Commencement of Genesis.

Do you recollect the Tenor of the Passage?
The Promise of the Saviour that was to come whose Heel was to be bruised. This is the Note: "It shall crush, &c.,—ipsa, she,—the Woman; so divers of the Fathers read this Place, conformably to the Latin; others read it ipsum, viz. the Seed. The Sense is the same, for it is by her Seed, Jesus Christ, that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head." It appeared to me as a plain Reader that it gave a Superiority to the Woman over her Son.

That it made our blessed Lord the Instrument of the Woman?
Yes.

Do you think that sound Doctrine?
I do not.

Rev. J. Brown.

Do you think it heretical?
I do.

Does the Note justify that Interpretation of it?
It is the Note I read.

Have the goodness to read it again?
"It shall crush, &c.,—ipsa, she,—the Woman; so divers of the Fathers read this Place, conformably to the Latin; others read it ipsum, viz. the Seed. The Sense is the same; for it is by her Seed, Jesus Christ, that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head."

That Note seems to ascribe to the Efficacy of our Lord's Power the crushing the Serpent's Head, although the Instrument he uses for that Purpose is the Virgin?
No, not in my Opinion; quite the contrary.

State why you consider it to be quite the contrary?
"The Sense is the same; for it is by her Seed, Jesus Christ, that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head." It occurs first to a plain Mind like mine that if the Seed is under the Control of the Woman there must be a Superiority on the Part of the Woman; to a common Understanding that is the Inference; it appears to me to be gross Heresy.

Does not the Note state that it is by the Authority or Power of our Lord that the Woman does this?
It is not by his Authority; it is her Act by him, and of course putting him in subjection to her.

That he is used by her; is that your Meaning?
Yes. I have an Objection to the Translation or the View given of the Second Commandment. I have an Opinion also of the View given of the Doctrine of Justification; but without considerable Time to review the Passages I can perhaps scarcely give the whole of my View upon the Subjects. At the Time however a decided Impression was made upon my Mind that there was not a correct View of the Second Commandment.

Do you remember whether the Second Commandment appeared in a separate Paper, not in the Scripture Lessons?
I thought it was connected with the Scripture Lessons also; but it is a considerable Time since I examined them; having formed a decided Opinion upon those Points, I have not lately directed much Attention to them.

You have taken an active Part in the Education of the Poor, have you not?
Yes, in the District in which I live.

Have you experienced any material Difficulty in conducting the Schools upon Scriptural Principles in that District?
No, quite the contrary.

Have you had as Scholars, at the Schools conducted upon Scriptural Principles, a considerable Mixture of Children of different Religious Denominations?
Yes, of all the Denominations resident in the District.

Have you had many Roman Catholic Children?
Yes.

As many in proportion to their Numbers in the District as of Protestants either of the Church of England or the Presbyterian Body?
I should say nearly so.

At what Time?
I have them at the present Hour. At one Period of my Life, I believe about Fifteen Years since, I visited the South of Ireland, particularly the County of Tipperary, for a few Weeks; my Heart bled at the State of that Country. I returned with a deep Impression of the Value of Education; and being about to enter upon a Visitation of my own People, I announced the very Day when I was to visit a certain District, as I generally did, and I mentioned to them, that if at the Close of the Day I felt a Schoolhouse

Rev. J. Brown.

was necessary, I would meet with them, and with all Persons interested in Education, and meet with all Classes of Protestants, and with the Roman Catholics as readily. In our District they are not nearly so numerous; our Parish is very much a Presbyterian Parish; but I wished them to subscribe according to their Means, and the Roman Catholics to subscribe according to their Means, and we obtained Aid from the Kildare Place Society. I memorialized the Worshipful Company of Ironmongers and obtained Aid from them, and with the Assistance of the Linendrapers, who form a considerable Part of my Congregation, I was enabled to place in that Parish a very respectable Number of Schools; and I established some at a Distance; and I obtained a direct Influence in and a very considerable Influence over twice the Number. I established Nine connected with my Neighbourhood, and I obtained an indirect Influence over twice that Number. In those Cases I obtained the decided Co-operation of the Roman Catholics, and the Schools were generally connected with the Kildare Place Society while it existed, and there was no serious Opposition to it in the District. It may be fair for me, perhaps, to add that there was one Circumstance that gave me Weight with my Neighbours of that Persuasion; I have refused to identify myself with any of the Parties of the County. I incurred Displeasure once by refusing to preach to an Orange Lodge; I told them when they applied to me, that I thought such Processions injurious; and at the Time when there was formed, on the Mountains that separate our Valley from Newton Limavaddy, a System of waylaying Persons who had given Offence, I felt it my Duty to interfere. I announced my Intention to interfere; I gave Notice of my preaching there; the People said I should bring the People together, and there would be a Quarrel. I felt a great deal surprised with the Multitude; there were about a Thousand People met, and the Majority Roman Catholics. I preached to them, and I have Reason to think I put a Stop to that System of waylaying; I induced the People to exert themselves to put it down, and I have not heard of it in that District since. In consequence of this I had an Influence which some others have not had in promoting Education in the Parish in which I live. In the Parish of Aghadowey and Grange of Agivey there exist very nearly 8,500 Persons; of those there are 1,600 Roman Catholics, not quite 500 Episcopalians, and all the rest Presbyterians of our Denomination and other Denominations; that is, 8,500 People resident in Aghadowey and Agivey, and who require neither Soldier nor Policeman; and it will be felt that where Education had produced such Results as I met with it is not surprising that I am very unwilling to tamper with a System which had been so advantageous. Those Schools have been in operation, and in all of them, and in many other Places besides, we have Sunday Schools, where the Scriptures are read freely; and in the Schools I have not observed the Roman Catholics are at all disinclined to receive Scriptural Education. On the contrary, there was a Case in point: a School once established on my own Farm was sought to be connected with the Board; it was a Priest who came into the Neighbourhood from the turbulent District of Innishowen; he thought he should have Matters his own Way; he sent me this Message, that it should be connected with the Board; I sent him Word that the Communication between the Synod and the Board had not terminated, and I begged to be excused; he held Stations round me, and endeavoured to turn the Minds of our People; he obtained Signatures to the Document; he endeavoured to procure Protestant Signatures; Two of his People went from Public House to Public House, and on various Pretences obtained Signatures; they took the Signatures in several Instances of Minors. There was another Stratagem employed; one of the Elders of my Congregation, an Architect, had prepared an Estimate for the Repairs of the Schoolhouse, and they showed his Signature, and induced the simple People to believe he was favourable to the new Board Connexion. The Consequence was, that several Protestants signed this Document. I heard nothing of it until it was on its Way to Dublin. It had been carried to the Rector of the Parish, and he, thinking all was right, signed it. Notice was given to me on the Sabbath that the Thing was on its Way the preceding Day; on the next Day I summoned the Committee of the School together, and was much surprised to find, not the Committee, when I went there, but a vast Collection of my Roman Catholic Neighbours who had changed Aspects since the last Communication I had held with them; they appeared dissatisfied.

Rev. J. Brown.

I made my Way amongst them and went into the Schoolhouse, and availed myself of the Privilege of addressing them; I told them what I had heard, and called forward the Two Men who had carried the Document; they came forward and acknowledged they had carried it. I brought forward several Individuals who had been misled; I took a Minute of their Statement, and at the same Time, if I am not making my Statement too long, it is right to add that I addressed the Roman Catholics especially. I took a New Testament and I read the Directions, as it were,—the Addresses of the Epistles, and showed them they were not addressed to the Clergy but to the Christians at such Places; and I put it to them, if a Letter was addressed to any of them through the Post Office, what they would think of any Individual who would arrest it in its Way and deprive them of reading it. Such was the Impression made upon their Minds that a decent Neighbour rose up and said that he thought his Reverence was right, and at all events they should allow me Time to bring the Negotiation with the Government to a close; this was the State of the Matter at that Time when that Meeting broke up. I wrote to the Board stating the Facts, the Protestant Party having drawn up a Document stating that they disapproved of the Connexion with the Board. I enclosed this Document to the Board, and entreated to be informed who was their Correspondent; I addressed also a Letter to Mr. Carlile, requesting as a personal Favour, that he would inform me who was the Correspondent. I have understood since from him that that Letter did not reach him; but I received a Letter from Mr. Kelly inducing me to believe there was no Application that the Board would listen to. Thus the Matter stood with them, and I still insisted on knowing who was the Correspondent; I wrote to obtain that Information. I received a Second Letter from Mr. Kelly, stating that I need not be under any Apprehension, that there would be no Interference, at least that there were no Funds. I had been afraid the Peace of the District would be disturbed, but I felt, on Receipt of Mr. Kelly's Letter, satisfied there was no Danger. I thought the Matter would be arranged, and under that Impression I wrote a Letter to the Board thanking them for their polite Attention to my Representation, and expressing my Determination, so far as I had any Influence with the Synod of Ulster, that I would use it to bring forward an amicable Adjustment. Having just sent this Letter to the Post Office I went from my own House towards the Schoolhouse, and seeing Two Gentlemen alighting at the Schoolhouse, I found to my great Surprise they were Dr. Finn, the Inspector, and the Roman Catholic Priest; the Master was a Roman Catholic; because I never had unkind Feelings to that Body, I used my Influence to have them in the School. After being introduced, I took the Liberty of inquiring what brought Dr. Finn there, as I had not given him any Invitation to visit the School; he justified himself by a Reference to his Book, and from the Book I found, for the first Time, who was the Correspondent.

Who was the Correspondent?

The Correspondent was the Priest of Coleraine, who also officiates in the Parish of Oghadowey.

What was his Name?

Mr. O'Dogherty.

What was the Name of the School?

Droghed. I had been aided in the Erection of that School by all Parties, and especially by a neighbouring Gentleman, and was anxious to preserve it for the Purpose for which it was built. I had got a Grant from the Ironmongers Company, on whose Estate it was placed, for a School to be conducted on those Principles. After some Explanation, I entered into a Conversation with those Gentlemen; and it so happened that Persons were passing from a Funeral; they came in, and I purposely left them with the Inspector to enter into a Discussion upon the Subject; and I am sure if your Lordships were aware of all which passed you would see that they were fully aware of the Benefits of the old System,— that they perfectly comprehended the Distinction between that and the new. They stated how the School had been conducted: that the Children in the Bible Class were reading in their Place while the other Business of the School was proceeding, and that every thing went on according to the Satisfaction of all Parties, Protestant and Roman

Rev. J. Brown.

Catholic. After this I wrote again to the Board, complaining of that which had been done, and I warned them that, as there was Scope enough for all their Funds, and we were provided with Schools, it would be desirable that they should leave our peaceful Vale alone. I used strong Language, but I felt that the Circumstances justified it.

What was the Date of that Letter?

It was near the Time when we had one of the Meetings in Belfast. I know that from a particular Circumstance; there was a Proposal to hold a Meeting, and to have further Discussions about it, which I discouraged, especially because I was summoned to one of those Meetings of the Committee held in Belfast. During my Absence some of the Members of the Committee collected the People together, and the Parties met. By that Time their Feelings were somewhat alienated from each other; and I was extremely alarmed, on my Return Home, at hearing of these Proceedings; fearing that the Peace of the District would be broken. In order however, having taken legal Advice, to protect myself, being aware that there could be no Interference with the Property, I rested satisfied. I was urged by the Protestant Party to turn out the Schoolmaster. I said, "No; so long as he does his Duty I have no Feeling of Revenge against him;" and by just pursuing that Course we have preserved the School in its Integrity. To this Hour it remains a respectable School, attended by from Eighty to 100 Children.

Connected with the Board?

No; I prevented that.

How many Catholics attended?

The Majority of the Children attending it are Roman Catholics.

Have you the same Schoolmaster?

Yes. During the Period of the Excitement the Master waited upon me, and stated, "Unless you will consent to connect this School with the Board there will be an opposition School, which must injure mine." Said I, "That is Matter for your own Consideration; the more Schools the better, if they are conducted on proper Principles; but I must stand up for the Rights and Privileges of the People, and I am not willing to surrender the Scriptures." A School was raised in opposition; it was taught also by a Roman Catholic; a considerable Number of People were collected. Such however were the kind Feelings that existed in that District, that when the School was established it was attended, not only by a considerable Number of Roman Catholics, but of Protestants of various Denominations; and I have gone into it on the Days on which I was passing in my ordinary Visitation in the Neighbourhood, and I there found the Bible and Testament in the Hands of the Children as they were in our own Schools, and not exclusively in the Hands of the Protestants, but of a considerable Number who were Roman Catholics.

That School was not in connexion with the Board?

No; that School went down after some Time; it was just raised by a temporary Ebullition of Feeling, and by maintaining good Temper I put it down. Our School exists under the same Master, that Excitement having passed away.

Have you the same Priest in your Parish now who wished to put your School under the Board?

Yes; he is not resident in that Parish; he is the Priest of Coleraine; he has, I think, Eight Parishes.

Does he make any Opposition to your School now?

No, not that I hear.

You do not think you have lost any of the Roman Catholic Children?

No.

How many Children are there attending?

From Eighty to One hundred.

What Version of the Scripture is used in your School?

The Authorized Version only; and before I left Home I had Application from the Teacher to procure a Number of Testaments; he also aided me last

Rev. J Brown.

Summer in conducting the Sunday School, where the Authorized Version is read.

Except for that Exhibition of Party Spirit, is it your Opinion that the Plans of the Board would be acceptable to the People in your Neighbourhood?

Decidedly not. Of course the Roman Catholics would attend to the Advice of the Priests, but they stated that their Object was to obtain a good Education for their Children, and that they did not wish to obtain any Change of System.

Do you think that it might have been made acceptable to the People by the Board acceding to the Proposition of the Synod, and allowing the Use of the Scriptures?

I cannot help thinking that if the Government had not committed the Blunder of turning us over to negotiate with the Board, but had gone through with it, the Thing would have turned out differently. If Earl Grey had proceeded as he begun we should not then have been annoyed as we have been by perpetual Changes, and the Sort of Correspondence in which we have been engaged; but having formed a distinct System, I do not think it very likely that we should now submit to the Introduction of any other System. I think that ours is likely to be very popular.

Is it not a Principle laid down by the Board, that where Schools are well conducted, though they have been established on other Principles from those of the Board, they do not interfere?

I do not know what they may do in other Cases; I know they have appeared too anxious to obtain Possession of this School. I found it a very unpleasant Thing for the first Time in my Life to be involved in a Scene of Dispute with my Neighbours, with whom I was living in Habits of Peace, and I thought it a Want of Courtesy that they would not allow me to know the Name of the Correspondent.

Did it appear to you that the Board showed a Disposition to interfere with that School without the Sanction of the Patron or the leading Supporter of it?

It did appear to me at that Time.

And that the Board were unwilling to mention to you the Name of the Person who corresponded with them?

I requested it twice, but they did not send it to me; subsequently Mr. Carlile assured me, and I have no Doubt of his Veracity in the Case, that my Letter did not reach him; how that occurred I cannot tell.

It was a considerable Time after that Letter was addressed to Mr. Carlile that you learned it was the Priest from Coleraine who had been the Correspondent of the Board?

Yes.

You have said that the System of the Board is not acceptable to the People of your Neighbourhood, and that there was considerable Feeling against it in that Neighbourhood?

Yes, I know there was, and is.

Do not you conceive that may have been owing to the decided Opposition you had manifested to the System?

Independently of that altogether, I am satisfied there is a decided Opposition to the System.

Do you not think it is in some degree owing to that?

To a certain degree, no Doubt it is; but I am quite persuaded that I could not have persuaded the People in the District to be favourable to the System.

You think that if, at the Period when your Influence was exerted against the System of the Board, it had been exerted in favour of that System, it would have been unavailable?

That is supposing a Thing utterly impossible, so long as the Scriptures are excluded. It is impossible for any one who knows the Value of Scriptural Education

Rev. J. Brown.

Education to exert his Influence to exclude them; and happily on this momentous Subject our People judged for themselves.

You have said that you have Nine Schools under your Care already; would it not be physically impossible for you to superintend in those Nine Schools general Instruction, or any Religious Instruction, efficiently, if you were limited to stated Hours, according to the Rules of the Board?
I think it would be impossible,—quite impossible.

Is yours a peculiar Parish in respect to Extent?
No; the Population is extremely dense.

Parishes are not your Divisions?
No; we are not confined to Parishes.

Do not frequently the Parishes of Protestant Clergymen reach to a greater Extent than your own District?
Yes.

From your Knowledge of the Extent of those Districts, and the Number of Schools commonly established in each of those Districts, do you think it would be physically possible for the Clergy in general of the Established Church to attend to all the Schools if placed under the National Board that might be established in those Parishes, and also for the Presbyterian Clergy to attend to all Schools in their Neighbourhood, if they were limited to a certain Hour?
I think decidedly not. A great many of the Presbyterian Clergy of the Synod of Ulster have very large Congregations; I know many that have under their Cure from 600 to 1,000 Families, and who have been very attentive to the Schools; many of them have as great a Number as myself; some considerably more. My Neighbour, Mr. Parke of Ballymoney, has considerably more, and I know several others who have a great many more than I have.

You say you could not support the present System so long as the Board remains constituted in the Manner it is at present constituted. Do you refer to the Constitution of the Board personally, or to the Manner in which they have conducted their Proceedings?
I feel greatly obliged to your Lordship for putting that Question; it is not personally that I feel an Objection to the Board, but to the Manner in which they have acted, and the Principles to which I have referred. I believe I have never seen any of them to my Knowledge except One, and that Individual I respect highly personally; I only object to his Actings and Doings.

You do not object to the Board because there is a Clergyman of the Church of England upon it or because there are Roman Catholic Clergymen upon it?
No.

Do you object to it because there is a Socinian upon it?
No, not upon that Principle neither. I have acted with Men of various Views, and I co-operated cordially with the former Priest of the Parish in promoting Education. I had not that Sort of Feeling; but I wish myself and People of my Persuasion to be as free as others.

You state that when you saw the System of the Board first you objected to it on Principle, and determined not to tease yourself any more about it?
Yes, I did so, as I saw a Determination to limit the Use of the Word of God.

When did you form this Determination?
It was when I found that the Scriptures were not freely admissible.

Do you recollect when that Time was?
It was about the Close of the Negotiation of the Synod's Committee.

Since that Period you have abstained from making any Inquiry respecting the Operation of the System?
Not altogether; I have availed myself of every Opportunity of gaining Information, and at one Time a Knowledge of its Operation was forced upon me; and I have, when I have travelled, anxiously got Information from Persons I have met about the Manner in which it was conducted. I felt I could not

Rev. J. Brown.

rely on Newspaper Publications or ex parte Statements published; and I do affirm there is no reasonable Sacrifice I would not be ready to make to get Education to my Country.

What did you mean by saying you determined not to tease yourself about it?

I determined that as I saw the System working I could have no Connexion with it, and I determined therefore to confine my Attention to the Department in which I moved, and to secure to the Children the free Use of the Scriptures, however distressing it might be to the Teachers to want Government Funds.

And not to pay further Attention to the general working of the System?

Only in a general Way. I thought it a hopeless Thing to endeavour to turn them off from the Ground they had occupied; and as they showed a Want of plain Dealing, I thought it best to keep clear of them.

Have you prepared a Return distinguishing the Presbyterian Clergymen who are stated in the Return of the 8th of March 1837 to be Correspondents of the Board of National Education for Schools under that Board?

I have distinguished in the List those who are Members of the Synod of Ulster, those who are Members of the Presbytery of Antrim, those who are Seceders, those who are Remonstrants, and those who have been degraded.

The same is delivered in, and read, and is as follows:

Presbyterian Clergymen.

Denomination.	Name of Clergyman.	Name of School.	Parish.	County.
Remonstrant	Alexander, Rev. N.	Ballyquillan	Killead	Antrim.
Synod of Ulster	Allen, Rev. Robert	Shankey	Donaghendry	Tyrone.
		Drumgonnell		
Ditto	Barnett, Rev. John	Mowilliam	Ardrea	Londonderry.
Remonstrant	Blakely, Rev. F.	Tullygiwin	Comber	Down.
		Carryduffe	Drumbo	
Seceder	Coulter, Rev. John	Ballymaglaff	Comber	Ditto.
Presbytery of Antrim	Carley, Rev. James	Dungonnell	Killead	Antrim.
Synod of Ulster	Cochrane, Rev. D.	Annaloughey	Aughaloo	Tyrone.
		Glencull	Errigle Keran	
		Gort	Ditto	
Ditto	Dugall, Rev. Thomas	Mullantine	Drumeree	Armagh.
		Ballyquilley	Kilmore	
		Richmount	Drumeree	
Ditto	Dill, Rev. John	Hightown	Shankill	Antrim.
		Ballipalleday	Templepatrick	
Seceder	Evans, Rev. D.	Pomeroy	Pomeroy	Tyrone.
Synod of Ulster	Fisher, Rev. John	Market Hill	Market Hill	Armagh.
Remonstrant	Glendy, Robert Wm.	Gleroe	Ralloo	Antrim.
		Ballyvallough	Ditto	
		Loughmourne (2)	Ditto	
		Windy Gap	Templecorrin	
		Ballycarrey	Ditto	
		Witch Thorn	Kilroot	
Degraded	Gibson, Rev. J. D.	Ballywalter	St. Andrew's	Down.
Synod of Ulster	Hamilton, Rev. John	Thurlough	Thurlough	Mayo.
Presbytery of Antrim	Heron, Rev. William	Doagh	Grange of Doagh	Antrim.
		Ballyclare (2)	Ditto	
		Palentine	Ballylinney	
Synod of Ulster	Harpur, Rev. James	Tullyhatua	Muckno	Monaghan.
		Carrickaslane	Ditto	
		Mullaghance	Clontibrit	
		Tossey	Aughamullen	
Ditto	Henderson, Rev. John	Mulnahorn	Aughaloo	Tyrone.
Seceder	Logan, Rev. William	Castleroddy	Cappagh	Ditto.
		Beltoney		
Degraded	Love, Rev. S.	Temple Meeting House	Derrynose	Armagh.
Seceder	Lowry, Rev. John	Showerflood	Aughaloo	Tyrone.
	Lyle, Rev. William	Cranagh Hill	Dunhoe	Ditto.
Seceder	M'Millan, Rev. J.	Lyle Hill	Templepatrick	Antrim.
		Kilcross	Killead	
		Cormavey (2)	Ditto	
		Ballintoag	Templepatrick	

Denomination.	Name of Clergyman.	Name of School.	Parish.	County.
Synod of Ulster	Moore, Rev. William	Magherascullian	Desertlin	Londonderry.
		Tintaught	Lissan	
Presbytery of Antrim	Moore, Rev. Hugh	Ballyrogan	Newtown Ards	Down.
		Ballycullen		
		Cullysburn		
		Craigantlet		
		Green Graves		
Remonstrant	Montgomery, Rev. A.	Feystown	Tickmacreevan	Antrim
Ditto	Mulligan, Rev. John	Bottear	Moira	Down.
Synod of Ulster	M'Kee, Rev. Joseph	Killead	Killead	Antrim.
		Dungonnell		
Seceder	M'Kee, Rev. David	Tullintauvally	Annaghlone	Down.
Synod of Ulster	M'Cance, Rev. J.	Ballystockart	Comber	Ditto.
Presbytery of Antrim	Nelson, Rev. S. C.	Dromore	Dromore	Ditto.
		Listullicorrin		
Ditto	Porter, Rev. Classon	Toreagh	Magheramore	Antrim.
		Mullocksandal	Kilwaughter	
		Craiganorne	Ditto	
		Ballycraigg	Carmoney	
Seceder	Porter, Rev. James	Ardaghy	Kilcoo	Down.
Synod of Ulster	Reid, Rev. Dr.	Carrickfergus	Carrickfergus	Antrim.
		Woodlawn		
		Carrickfergus, No. 1.		
		Loughinourne		
Degraded	Skelly, Rev. William	Donaghadee	Donaghadee	Down.
	Stewart, Rev. John	Blackhill	Magheramore	Antrim.
		Mullaghnossin		
	Sinclair, Rev. James	Ballinahinch	Kilmore	Armagh.
Remonstrant	Whyte, Rev. D.	Ballee	Ballee	Down.
Synod of Ulster	Whyteside, Rev. J.	Gateside	Coleraine	Londonderry.
Ditto	Woods, Rev. Hugh	Conlig	Bangor	Down.
Presbytery of Antrim	Watson, Rev. D.	Ballyhinlor	Tyrella	Ditto.

Have you prepared a Return also distinguishing the Presbyterian Clergymen who are stated in the Return of the 17th of July 1835 to have received Grants from the National Board in aid of Schools?

I have so far as I know distinguished those who are Members of the Synod of Ulster, those who are Members of the Synod of Munster, those who are Members of the Presbytery of Antrim, those who are Remonstrants, those who are Seceders; I believe some of them to be Independents, and I have marked them accordingly; I have no Objection to Independents, but it is a Mistake to place them under the Head of Presbyterians. I beg to say as to both the Lists that there may be Mistakes, but I have marked them according to the best of my Information.

The same is delivered in, and read, and is as follows:

Denomination.	Name.	School.	Parish.
	COUNTY ANTRIM.		
Presbytery of Antrim	John Scott Porter	Donegal St., M.	Belfast City.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
Presbytery of Antrim	John Scott Porter	Frederick St., M.	Ditto.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
Remonstrant	H. Montgomery	Upper Falls	Belfast.
Presbytery of Antrim	William Bruce, junior	Sigoniel	Ditto.
Seceder	Robert Wilson	Springfield	Ditto.
	William Bruce, junior	Edenderry	Ditto.
	J. Scott Porter		
Independent	Robert M'Master	Bruslee	Ballylinny.
Presbytery of Antrim	William Heron		
Seceder	John Wright		
Presbytery of Antrim	William Heron	Palentine	Ditto.
	John Wright		
	William Heron	Skilganaban	Ballynure.
	William Heron	Tilderg	Ballycarton.
Synod of Ulster	W. J. Raphael		
Remonstrant	Thomas Alexander	Cairn Castle	Cairn Castle.
	Thomas Alexander	Ballycraigy, M.	Carmoney.
Seceder	George M'Caughey	Ditto F.	Ditto.

Rev. J. Brown.

Denomination.	Name.	School.	Parish.
Synod of Ulster -	James Seaton Reid -	Carrickfergus, M. -	Carrickfergus(Town).
Independent -	William Flinter - -	Ditto F. -	Ditto.
	James S. Reid - -	Kilroot - -	Ditto.
	J. S. Reid - -	Woodburn - -	Ditto.
	William Flinter - -		
	J. S. Reid - -	Carrickfergus, No. 2. -	Ditto.
	William Flinter - -		
	J. S. Reid - -	Duncrew - -	Ditto.
	William Flinter - -		
	J. S. Reid - -	Loughmourne, No. 1. -	Ditto.
	William Flinter - -		
	William Flinter - -	Ballyloggin - -	Ditto.
	J. S. Reid - -		
Presbytery of Antrim	James Carley - -	Tairinlough - -	Drummau.
	H. Montgomery - -	Collin - - -	Derryaghy.
	H. Montgomery - -	Dunmurray - -	Drumbeg.
Degraded - -	John Doherty - -	Doagh - -	Grange of Doagh.
	William Heron - -		
	William Heron - -	Ballyclare, No. 2. -	Ditto.
Presbytery of Antrim	J. C. Ledlie - -	Mullocksandel - -	Kilwaughter.
and now	J. C. Ledlie - -	Kilwaughter - -	Ditto.
Synod of Munster.	John M'William - -	Kilcross - -	Killead.
	John M'William -	Cormery, No. 2. -	Ditto.
	Robert Orr - -	Straidhavern - -	Ditto.
	H. Montgomery - -		
Remonstrant -	Nat. Alexander - -		
	Nat. Alexander - -	Ballyquillan - -	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster -	Joseph M'Kee - -	Killead Meeting House	Ditto.
	Joseph M'Kee - -	Dungonnell - -	Ditto.
	James Carley - -		
Synod of Ulster -	William Wauhope -	Ballymona - -	Kirkenreola.
	William Wauhope -		
Synod of Ulster -	Alexander Patterson (since withdrawn).	Clinty - - -	Ditto.
Remonstrant - -	William Glendy - -	Witchthorn - -	Kilroot.
	J. C. Ledlie - -	Larne, M. - -	Larne.
		Ditto, F. - -	Ditto.
	Thomas Alexander -	Ballycraigy - -	Ditto.
	George M'Caughey -		
Synod of Ulster -	John Stuart - -	Black Hill - -	Magheramorna.
	John Stuart - -	Mallaghmossin -	Ditto.
	J. C. Ledlie - -	Toreagh - - -	Raloo.
	J. C. Ledlie - -	Glenoe - - -	Ditto.
	William Glendy -	Ballyvallough - -	Ditto.
	William Glendy -	Loughmourne, No. 2. -	Ditto.
	John Simmons - -	Moyarget - -	Ramoan.
Synod of Ulster -	Hugh Hamilton - -	Glenbuck, F. - -	Rasharkin.
	H. Montgomery -	Hannahstown, M. -	Shankill.
		Ditto F. -	Ditto.
Seceder - -	John M'Mullen -	Lyle Hill - -	Templepatrick.
	Robert M'Master -	Ballypalliday - -	Ditto.
	John M'Mullen - -	Ballintoag - -	Ditto.
Remonstrant -	Robert Campbell -	Malusk - -	Ditto.
	William Glendy - -	Ballycary - -	Templecorran.
	William Glendy - -	Windygap - -	Ditto.
	Alexander Montgomery -	Faystown - -	Tickmanevan.
Synod of Ulster -	Alexander Montgomery -	Harp Hall - -	Ditto.

COUNTY ARMAGH.

Synod of Ulster -	P. S. Henry - -	Armagh, M. - -	Armagh (City).
		Ditto, F. - -	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster -	Thomas Dugall - -	Richmount - -	Drumera.
Degraded - -	Solomon Love - -	Temple Meeting House	Derrynoose.
Independent -	John Carroll - -	Rich Hill - -	Kilmore.
	Thomas Dugall -	Ballywilly, M. - -	Ditto.
		Ditto F. - -	Ditto.
Remonstrant -	James Sinclair - -	Ballynabinch, M. -	Ditto.
		Ditto F. -	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster -	John Fisher - -	Market Hill - -	Market Hill.

COUNTY CAVAN.

Synod of Ulster -	Joseph Denham - -	Coronang, M. - -	Kellyshandra.
		Ditto F. - -	Ditto.

207

Rev. J. Brown.

Denomination.	Name.	School.	Parish.
	COUNTY DONEGAL.		
Synod of Ulster	David Hamilton	Cock Hill, M.	Fahan, Lower.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster	W. D. Killen	Ballyhooly	Raphoe.
	COUNTY DOWN.		
Seceder	David M'Kee	Tullintanoally	Armaghlone.
	Alexander Orr		
	John Johnson	Loughbrickland	Aghaderg.
Synod of Ulster	Hugh Woods	Crawsfordburn	Bangor.
	Hugh Woods	Conlig	Ditto.
Remonstrant	David Whyte	Ballee	Ballee.
Seceder	John Coulter	Ballymaglaff	Comber.
Remonstrant	Fletcher Blakely	Tullygirvin	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster	John M'Cance	Ballystockart	Ditto.
Presbytery of Antrim	S. C. Nelson	Tullymacarat	Dromore.
	S. C. Nelson	Kilsorrell	Ditto.
	S. C. Nelson	Dromore, M.	Ditto.
	John Ross	Ditto, F.	Ditto.
	S. C. Nelson	Listullycorron	Ditto.
Seceder	James Porter	Maghermayo	Drumgooland, Lower.
	David Whyte	Corbally	Dunsford.
	Fletcher Blakely	Carryduff	Drumbo.
Seceder	James Moorehead	Donaghcloney	Donaghcloney.
Remonstrant	John Watson	Tullycavey	Grey Abbey.
Degraded	J. A. D. H. Gibson	Ballyblack, Lower	Ditto.
	William Heron	Ballyclare	Grange of Doagh.
Presbytery of Antrim	S. Watson	Ardmillan	Killinchy.
	S. Watson	Ballymacashan	Ditto.
	S. Watson	Ballymacreely	Ditto.
Remonstrant	David Watson	Aughlishnafin	Kilmigan.
	David Watson	Mount Panther, M.	Ditto.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
Seceder	James Porter	Ballymoney	Kilcoo.
	James Porter	Ardaghy	Ditto.
	David Whyte	Rossglass	Kilclief.
	David Watson	Laughin Island	Laughin Island.
	David Watson	Annadoyne	Ditto.
	Alexander Orr	Mulligans	Leapatrick.
Remonstrant	James Davis		
Remonstrant	John Mulligans	Bottier	Moira.
	J. C. Nelson		
Presbytery of Antrim	Hugh Moore	Ballyrogan	Newtown Ards.
	Hugh Moore	Cullysburn	Ditto.
	Hugh Moore	Craigantlet	Ditto.
	Hugh Moore	Greengroves	Ditto.
	David Watson	Tyrilla and Ballykula	Tyrilla.
	COUNTY LONDONDERRY.		
Remonstrant	William Porter	Ballycarton	Aughanloo.
Synod of Ulster	William Browne	Brackagh Dysart	Ballynascreen.
	William Porter	Roe Mill	Drumachose.
Synod of Ulster	William Moore	Magherascullion	Desertlin.
Synod of Ulster	James Wilson	Grange	Ditto.
	William Browne	Brakah Rowley	Kilcronaghan.
	William Moore	Tintagh	Lissan.
	James Wilson	Magherafelt	Magherafelt.
	William Porter	Ballamacleary	Tamlaght Ard or Magilligan.
	COUNTY MONAGHAN.		
Synod of Ulster	James Harper	Tossey	Aughnamullin.
	James Harper	Mullahana	Clontibrit.
	James Harper	Carrickaslane	Mucknoe.
	John Arnold	Leitrim	Tyholland.
	COUNTY TYRONE.		
	John Rowley	Showerflood	Aughaloo.
Synod of Ulster	David Cochran	Armaloughy	Ditto.
	James Collins	Rahaghy	Ditto.
Synod of Ulster	John Henderson		
	Charles Hemphill	Castledample	Badony, Upper.

Rev. J. Brown.

Denomination.	Name.	School.	Parish.
Synod of Ulster	Charles Hemphill	Clougherney	Badony, Upper.
	David Cochrane	Gort	Clonfeacle.
Synod of Ulster	James Phillips	Five-mile Town, M.	Clogher.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
	D. C. Walker	Sisnarrow	Donaghedy.
	T. J. Porter		
	John Samson	Blackfort	Donaghevy.
Synod of Ulster	Robert Allen	Shankey	Donaghendry.
	Robert Allen	Drumgonnal	Ditto.
Seceder	Samuel M'Curdy		
Synod of Ulster	David Bennett	Dungannon, M.	Drumglass.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
	David Cochrane	Glencull, M.	Errigal Riernan.
		Ditto F.	Ditto.
	John Bidge	Mullyroden	Killeshil.
Synod of Ulster	Francis J. Porter	Cloghcor	Leckpatrick.
Seceder	D. Evans	Pomeroy	Pomeroy.
Synod of Ulster	John Hogg	Lisnagleer	Ditto.

COUNTY ANTRIM.

Synod of Ulster	W. J. Raphael	Ballycor	Ballycarton.
Seceder	John Wright		
Presbytery of Antrim	John Porter	Edenderry	Belfast.
	William Brice junior	Carrickfergus	Carrickfergus.
	James S. Reid		
	William Flinter		
	Joseph M'Kee	Dungownell	Killead.

COUNTY ARMAGH.

	P. Shuldam	Charlemont Place	Armagh (City).
	Henry George Tilly		

COUNTY DOWN.

	S. C. Nelson	Bally Alley	Garvaghey.
	David Watson	Annsborough	Kilmigan.

COUNTY DONEGAL.

Synod of Ulster	William Scott	Ballybegley	All Saints.
Synod of Ulster	John Wray	Maheracorrin	Raphoe.

COUNTY FERMANAGH.

Synod of Ulster	James M'Williams	Lislea	Aughlercher.

COUNTY TYRONE.

Seceder	John Bridge	Brossloy	Clonfeacle.
Synod of Ulster	James M'Clintock	Omagh	Drumsane.
	John Hogg	Gortnalush	Donamore.
Synod of Ulster	F. J. Porter	Donagheady	Donagheady.
	Alexander Brittain		
Synod of Ulster	S. Taylor Raye		

COUNTY CORK.

Synod of Munster	W. Jilliard Hort	Blarneylane	Shandon.
		Ditto, F.	Ditto.
Synod of Munster	J. Hans Sloane	Sundays Well	St. Mary's Shandon.
	M. J. Hort		

COUNTY DUBLIN.

Synod of Munster	James Armstrong	St. Thomas	St. Thomas.

KING'S COUNTY.

Methodist Preacher	Mat. Magill	Congart Park	Shinrone.

COUNTY LOUTH.

Seceder	Josias Wilson	Palace Street	St. Peter's.
		Ditto, F.	Ditto.
	Josias Wilson	Drogheda, F.	Ditto.
	Josias Wilson	Patrician	Ditto.

209

Rev. J. Brown.

Denomination.	Name.	School.	Parish.
	COUNTY WESTMEATH.		
Synod of Ulster	Alexander Gibson	Mullingar, M. Ditto, F.	Mullingar. Ditto.
	COUNTY DUBLIN.		
Synod of Munster	James Armstrong Joseph Hutton	Glassnevin	Glassnevin.
	COUNTY MAYO.		
Synod of Ulster	John Hamilton	Turlough	Turlough.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

211

Die Martis, 21° Martii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

The Reverend HUGH WALKER ROGERS is called in, and examined as follows:

You are Moderator of the Synod of Ulster?
I have the Honour of being Moderator of the Synod of Ulster.

Have you been long a Member of the Synod?
I have been a Member of the Synod of Ulster since the Year 1825.

Have you taken an active Part in Committees and other Concerns of the Synod?
I have been on several Committees of the Synod.

For how many Years?
For several Years.

Were you cognizant of the Propositions made by the Synod of Ulster in 1833, first to Government, and afterwards to the National Board?
We had a Special Meeting of the Synod, I think, in the Year 1832, with reference to the proposed System of National Education for Ireland.

You may refer to any Documents before you for Certainty.
The Synod met on the Subject of National Education on the 11th of January 1832.

Were you present at that Meeting?
I was.

What Resolution was entered into at that Meeting?
There were a Number of Resolutions entered into with reference to that Question.

Will you read what you think necessary in answer to that Question?
I feel disposed to read the whole of the Resolutions: "At a Meeting of the General Synod of Ulster, specially convened at Cookstown on the 11th of January 1832, to take into consideration the new System of National Education for Ireland, the following Resolutions were passed, and ordered to be transmitted to all the Ministers and Congregations in connexion with it:—First, That, as Christian Ministers and Elders, we pray that Divine Grace and Blessing may descend abundantly upon the Person and Government of our Sovereign King William the Fourth; as dutiful and loyal Subjects, we declare our unshaken Attachment to the constitutional Principles which called the illustrious House of Hanover to the Throne; and, as Presbyterians, we rejoice with Gratitude to Almighty God in the distinguished Part taken by our Forefathers in the Advocacy of the Principles and the Promotion of the Measures which happily terminated in that great National Event. Secondly, That we feel grateful for the Countenance and Support which the Presbyterian Church in this Country has long continued to receive from Government, and more especially since the Accession of His Majesty's august Family. Thirdly, That nothing can be farther from our Thoughts than to embarrass His Majesty's Ministers by any Demand upon their Time and Attention in the present critical State of the Empire; nevertheless, the Principles and Measures relative to Education embodied in a Letter from the Chief Secretary for Ireland dated October 1831, and addressed to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, compel us to approach the Government and Legislature with a dutiful and faithful State-

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

ment of the Scriptural Principles adopted by us as a Church upon the Subject of popular Instruction. Fourthly, That it is our deliberate Opinion and decided Conviction that in a Christian Country the Bible, unabridged and unmutilated, should form the Basis of National Education, as we learn from Deut. vi. 6., Psal. cxix. 9., John xvii. 17., 2 Tim. iii. 14, 15, 16; and that consequently we never can accede to any System that in the least Degree interferes with the unrestricted Possession and Use of the Scriptures in our Schools. Fifthly, That we have heard with deep Regret that His Majesty's Government have proceeded to erect a Metropolitan Board of Education, vested with complete Control over all Schools and Teachers receiving public Aid, and an entire Control over all School Books, whether for Literary or Religious Education. Sixthly, That such an entire Control as by the Constitution of the Board the Government have vested in the Hands of one Member of this Body over all School Books employed by Ministers in the Religious Instruction of such Children of their Congregations as may attend the National Schools, cannot, in our Opinion, be transferred to nor be exercised by any one without innovating upon our constitutional Principles, and creating a Supremacy over a Church the absolute Purity of whose Ministers is and ever has been one of her distinguishing and essential Characteristics. Seventhly, That we cannot contemplate without peculiar Disapprobation that Part of the proposed System which requires any Member of the Synod that may be called to the Board to encourage Religious Teachers in the Inculcation of Doctrines which he must conscientiously believe to be directly opposed to the Sacred Scriptures. Eighthly, That for the Reasons embodied in the Four preceding Resolutions the Metropolitan Board has not received the Approbation and does not possess the Confidence of this Synod, and that our Ministers and People are earnestly entreated to keep themselves totally unconnected with it. Ninthly, That being aware of the Difficulties and Embarrassments of His Majesty's Government, arising from the conflicting Opinions, Claims, and Interests of Protestants and Roman Catholics, which we believe it impracticable for the Legislature ever to combine under one System of Education, except by Concessions of Principle upon our Part which we feel it to be impossible for us ever to make, yet feeling anxious respectfully to suggest a Plan that seems to us calculated to remove the Difficulties and Embarrassments of the Subject, we do resolve earnestly to entreat of His Majesty's Government, that if they cannot patronize an unrestricted Scriptural Education (the only System founded on Divine Authority) they will be pleased totally to abstain from establishing any Monopoly of Control over Teachers and School Books, leaving these Matters in the Hands of Parents, to whom the Allwise God has primarily committed the Trust; and if they cannot devise a Plan of granting pecuniary Aid without requiring such complete and entire Control in return, that they will be pleased to leave the Support of Schools for the Poor to the voluntary Contributions of the Friends of Education; by which Means both we and our People will be preserved from every Compromise of Religious Principle, and by which we doubt not that, under the Blessing of God, the Progress of National Education, as in many Instances Experience has already proved, will be happily and efficiently promoted. Tenthly, That we shall, by a loyal and dutiful and earnest Address to the Lord Lieutenant, and humble Petition to the Commons House of Parliament, endeavour to dissuade His Majesty's Government from the Establishment of a System founded upon a supreme Board vested with absolute and despotic Power; a Measure which we believe to be contrary to the soundest Principles of Political Economy, and which, by its contemplated Interference with the Integrity and unrestricted Use of the Scriptures, we believe to be opposed to the positive Declaration of the Word of God." Those are the Resolutions that more immediately refer to that Subject.

Were those Resolutions passed with much Opposition?

They were unanimously passed, as far as I can remember.

What was the next Step that the Synod of Ulster took with reference to the System of National Education?

The Synod subsequently appointed a Deputation to confer with His Majesty's Government in London.

When

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

When was that?
In the Year 1833, at the Annual Meeting.

At what Time; when was it commenced?
Our Annual Meeting always commences on the last Tuesday in June.

What was the Result of that Deputation?
The Deputation subsequently reported to the Synod, and after the Report of that Deputation was received the Synod drew up certain Propositions, which are embodied in our Minutes, expressive of its Mind upon the Subject.

Have you got those Propositions there?
I have.

Those are already before the Committee; what was the Answer that the Synod received from His Majesty's Government?
I feel in peculiar Difficulties, not being furnished with the Documents, but so far as I can command my Recollection upon the Subject, I will answer.

Was this the Communication you received: "I have read with great Attention the Four Resolutions extracted from the Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster assembled in June and July 1833, and am happy to say I see nothing in them which may not be agreed to as in perfect Accordance with the general Principles on which the new System of Education is founded; I trust therefore, that all Objections being now removed, we may look forward to the full Attainment of those Benefits for which that System was introduced?"
That was the Communication we received, signed by Lord Grey.

What did you do after you had received that Communication from Earl Grey?
We received about the same Time a Communication from Mr. Carlile, one of the Commissioners, stating that the Propositions of the Synod had been acceded to.

Have you got a Copy of it?
I have an Extract from it.

"Dear Sir, Office of Education, 10th September 1833.
"I have the Satisfaction of transmitting to you the following Extract from the Minutes of the Board of Commissioners of National Education, by which you will see that the Board have acceded to the Propositions agreed to by the Synod at its Meeting in June and July last.

"I am, &c. yours,
"J. CARLILE."

Have you got the Communication which he made from the Board which accompanied that?
I have not.

Does not that which you have read purport to be the whole of the Letter?
This is the whole of the Letter, but it refers to an Extract from the Minutes of the Board of Commissioners of National Education.

Was that Letter sent to every Minister of the Synod, so far as you know?
I understood it was.

Did you receive it yourself?
I did.

You were not Moderator at that Time?
No; our Moderators are annually appointed.

What passed after this?
I believe it was about that Period that one of our Committees charged with those Matters also circulated the following: "That the Moderator be instructed to notify to the Moderators of the respective Presbyteries, that the

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Negotiations of this Committee with the Board of National Education had for the present terminated unsatisfactorily.

What was the Date of that?
I think it was in 1834.

Are you acquainted with the Correspondence which took place between the Commissioners of Education and the Synod, beginning August the 27th, and continuing to February the 18th?
Not having been immediately connected with the Committees charged with those Subjects, I feel it impossible to enter into that Subject with Advantage.

You say that after the Correspondence, with which you are not acquainted, one of the Committees put forth a Letter; to what Purport was that Letter?
It was an Instruction issued by this Committee to the Moderator of the Synod, to inform the different Presbyteries, through their Moderators or Chairmen, that for the present the Negotiation of this Committee with the Board of National Education had terminated unsatisfactorily.

After this did the Synod take up the Matter at their next Annual Meeting?
They did.

At the Annual Meeting of the Synod held at Derry what took place?
There was a very protracted Discussion on the Subject of National Education; the Substance of the Question simply was, as I viewed it, whether the Propositions of the Synod were granted.

How was that Question decided?
It was decided negatively by the passing of an Amendment.

They were not considered to have been granted?
Just so.

The Vote of the Synod was denying that they were granted?
Yes.

Did you yourself vote upon that Occasion?
I did.

How did you vote?
I was impressed with the Idea that the Propositions of the Synod had been acceded to by the Board.

Then you supported the Affirmative?
I did.

Have you continued from that Time to support in any One Form the Affirmative of that Resolution?
I am rather disposed to think I was in error upon the Occasion.

How long after that Meeting did you change your Opinion?
My Mind has not been made up till lately on the Subject.

What has decided your Mind?
After that Meeting, and for a considerable Period, we were all impressed with the Idea that the Thing had come to an End; latterly, from the Appointment of your Lordships Committee, and from several other Circumstances, my Mind was again more intensely directed towards the Subject.

Then your Mind having been more intensely directed to this Subject, you have changed your Opinion from what it was at the Time of the Meeting in Derry?
I have.

Do you now think that the Board of Education did concede the Four Propositions laid before them by the Synod?
I believe not, in the Light in which I viewed the Propositions.

In which you viewed the Propositions at that Time, or now?
In which I viewed the Propositions at that Time and now.

215

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

You think your Notion that they had conceded them at that Time arose from your Misapprehension of what they had done?
So I believe.

You think that the Purport of what they did did not amount to a Concession?
Not in the Spirit in which I viewed those Resolutions.

Have the goodness to state in what Particulars?
In the first place, in the First Proposition we put it forth as an Expression of our Sentiments upon the Subject, that the People of our Church, without the necessary Concurrence of the Ministers or Members of any other Church, shall enjoy the Right of applying to the Board of Education for Aid to Schools, with a Statement of the Constitution and Regulations of the Schools, accompanied by an Engagement to adhere to them; but in this Proposition we recognize the Right of the Board to consider the Regulations, and decide accordingly.

Did you think that the Board departed from their Concession in that respect?
The Light in which I viewed that Proposition at that Time was simply this, that by putting forward an Application to the Board emanating from the Members of our Church, stating the Regulations of any particular School we had, unsupported by the Members or Ministers of other Churches, the Board should grant to us a Participation in its Privileges and Immunities in the Way of building, Support to Teachers, &c. &c.

Did you collect from the First Proposition, to which you considered the Board had agreed, that the Board was to do any thing more than receive your Propositions, containing the Regulations of any particular School, and thereupon to exercise their Discretion, according to the Regulations of the Board, whether that particular School should receive Assistance or not; is not that the Meaning of it?
I understand that in all Cases there is a Query Sheet furnished, in reply to which there are Answers still required, which are not consistent with my Views of Duty.

Is it on that Account you conceive they have not acceded to the First Proposition?
Yes.

Have not the Synod, in an authorized Communication to the Board, declared that they did not see any thing in the Query Sheet inconsistent with their own Rules and Regulations?
I understood the Board, or at least my Lord Grey, to have made such a Communication to the Synod.

Did you not know till 1834 that there was a Query Sheet sent?
I was not a Member of any of the Committees charged with National Education.

You were not aware of what took place between any of the Committees and the Board?
I am unable to speak of the Negotiations, further than the general Report furnished by the Committee went.

Are you to be understood that you consider the sending of the Sheet of Queries a Departure from what you understood to be your Proposition?
I believe that the sending of that Query Sheet, and thus requiring of me, for instance, certain Answers, would still make me a Party to Arrangements which I believe inconsistent with the Spirit of those Propositions.

Are you aware of a Letter having been sent on the 8th of November 1833, signed by Mr. Finly, then the Moderator of the Synod, in which this Passage occurs: "The Committee appointed by the Synod to submit certain Propositions to His Majesty's Government in reference to the Subject of National Education, having obtained from Government an Approval of the Modifications of that System contained in those Propositions, and also a similar Approval from the Board of Education, upon certain Queries being answered satisfactorily,

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

and seeing in the printed Query Sheet that there is no Query which may not, in their Opinion, be answered satisfactorily, without departing from those Propositions, and considering that in consequence of such Approval of our Propositions we are bound solely by the Constitution and Regulations of our Schools as they may be set forth in our Applications for Aid, and not by the printed "Regulations and Directions" of the Board, in which there are several Matters which appear to be incompatible with the Spirit and Meaning of our Propositions, it is the Opinion of this Committee that the Ministers and People of the General Synod of Ulster, if they see fit, may now make Application for Aid out of the Funds for National Education, strictly adhering to the Propositions agreed upon by the Synod?"

I am.

Are you to be understood that one of the Reasons why you now think the Board have departed from those Propositions arose out of the sending that Query Sheet?

Peculiar Difficulties in connexion with this Question present themselves to me, inasmuch as I never have been in any Form or Way connected with the National Board of Education nor with any of the Committees that had charge of that Measure, consequently I have not had the Opportunity of seeing those Documents to an Extent that enables me to inform your Lordships in the Manner I could desire upon this Subject.

You have had Access to that Query Sheet, for you state that that being required to be answered is one of the Reasons for your changing your Opinion?

With due Submission to your Lordships, I stated that I understood Things of that Nature to be in the Query Sheet which were inconsistent with my View of the Spirit of the Propositions.

Did you ever see the Query Sheet?

I believe I may say I never saw the Query Sheet of the National Board.

Never having been an Applicant to the National Board, you never saw the Query Sheet?

I have never been an Applicant to the National Board of Education. I now remember to have seen the Query Sheet through a Friend several Years ago; the only Instance, I believe, in which I ever saw it before To-day.

Originally you were of opinion the Board had not departed from their Propositions; you are now rather inclined to change that Opinion, and that arising partly out of this Query Sheet?

Yes; understanding that a Query Sheet is still enforced upon us, which requires us to make Concessions inconsistent with the Views and Feelings I hold as a professing Christian.

Do you mean that it is the same Query Sheet referred to in a Letter of the Moderator of the Synod, or a different Query Sheet?

I am unable to make that Distinction.

It is not from your own Inspection of the Query Sheet, but from having been told there was a Query Sheet which was inconsistent with your Regulations?

I have met with the Information in Documents which came before the Public in the Newspapers and otherwise, generally admitted to contain the Queries of the Board.

You have seen in a Newspaper Reference to a Query Sheet, which in your Opinion would be inconsistent?

I have.

Have you any Reason to believe that the Query Sheet now referred to, which you say you have seen represented in Newspapers, is different from that which the Synod, by their Moderator, have approved of?

I am totally unable to give an Answer to that Question.

In what Paper have you seen the Queries?

I believe in the Newspaper which comes occasionally into my own Hands.

I read

217

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

I read the Belfast News Letter; rather a liberal Paper in connexion with these Matters.

What is the particular Point in the Queries which raises your Objection?
Will you, for instance, set apart a particular Day or Days in the Week for the Purpose of allowing Ministers of other Religious Denominations different from your own to have Access to the Children, and will you join in that Arrangement.

That you believe to be one of the Queries?
That I believe to be one of the Queries.

That is one of the Queries to which you object?
Yes.

Do not you believe that was one of the Queries which the Synod of Ulster, by their Moderator's Letter, had declared was not inconsistent with their Principles?
I am not able to answer that Question.

You cannot say whether it is the Board have departed from their original Contract, or the Synod of Ulster have departed from their original Contract?
I do not say that the Synod of Ulster has not departed from their original Propositions, but I do not believe that they have.

If the Synod of Ulster have approved of those Queries, as not containing any thing inconsistent with their Propositions, it is the Synod of Ulster that have broken off from the Board, and not the Board from the Synod of Ulster?
I can only speak for myself.

In the Table of Queries to be answered by Applicants for Aid for the building of Schoolhouses at No. 8. there are these Words: "In the event of Aid being granted, will One Day at least in the Week, exclusive of Sunday, be set apart for the Religious Instruction of the Children by the Clergy, or otherwise approved by the Parents." Do those Words give you the Meaning you have stated to belong to One of the Queries?
They do.

You can understand that if other Persons received a different Impression from that, namely, that they were only applicable to Religious Instruction to Children of the same Religious Denomination as the Applicants, Persons who considered the Query as conveying that Meaning would not find it objectionable?
I should not conceive it objectionable, provided that it did not require me to be a Party to the Admission and providing to admit Persons to teach Children Doctrines and Principles which I believe to be erroneous.

Do you mean the Children of your Persuasion?
The Children of any Persuasion.

Is your Objection that you do not think you could be a Party to allowing a Religious Education to be given by Persons of a Religion different from your own, or is it to the Roman Catholic Religion exclusively you confine that Principle?
I apply that Principle to the Roman Catholic Religion.

That Religion is not consistent with your conscientious Principles, and you do not consider that any Board of Education ought to allow Religious Instruction to be given by Roman Catholics?
My Religious Feeling is, that uniting myself to the National Board would bind me to be indirectly a Party in teaching Roman Catholic Doctrines.

Though it were out of School Hours and the whole of the Children of your Community were absent?
I have given my Answer.

Did you think that if you agreed to that Query you should be bound to approve of the teaching of Roman Catholic Doctrines?
I believe it would bind me to afford every Convenience, and so far give my Countenance, to Principles I disapprove of.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Is it your Opinion, as a Religious Person, that it would be a Violation of Christian Duty to be instrumental in having any Religious Instruction given to Roman Catholics by Ministers of their own Persuasion?

Perhaps your Lordship will put the Question in this Form;—to be Party with a Roman Catholic in teaching what I believe, as a Protestant, to be Error.

You say you object to being made a Party to it; but does your Principle go to the Board of Education directing separate Religious Instruction to be given to Roman Catholics by Individuals of their own Persuasion?

I could not be a Party to such an Arrangement, conscientiously.

That is, you could not put yourself into Communication with a Board which maintained such a Principle as that?

What I mean to state is, that I conscientiously could not feel myself justified in entering into Arrangements that would bind me to open a Door, and to provide Facilities, and give Countenance so far to any Individual in teaching the peculiar Doctrines of that Denomination.

It comes to this, that you would not suffer your School to be in communication with the Board of Education unless they gave up the Notion of separate Religious Instruction being given by Ministers of the Roman Catholic Religion?

I believe it would relieve us from a great Difficulty if that were given up.

You state this with respect to the Roman Catholic Religion; you would not apply it to other Religions; the Members of the different Classes of Dissenters, for instance, an Unitarian Congregation; would you connect yourself with a Board which allowed separate Religious Instruction to be given by an Unitarian Minister to the Child of a Person professing Unitarian Doctrines?

I would object to whatever would in any way require others who had conscientious Objections to be Parties to such teaching.

In short, you would object to being in connexion with a Board which sanctioned the teaching of any System of Religion differing from your own?

In the essential Doctrines.

In what you consider to be the Fundamentals of Christianity?

Yes.

Is your Meaning that you should object to be a Party in affording Facilities to the teaching any Religious Doctrines which you consider to be at variance with the Fundamentals of Christianity?

Certainly.

You have been asked whether you would refuse to connect yourself with a Board which had any thing to do with the Religious Education of Roman Catholics; that Query Sheet is addressed to particular Persons, many of them requiring Aid towards building, therefore they must be themselves Contributors towards the building of the Schools; they must supply Funds for the Erection of Schools; is it your Meaning that you would not assist in supplying the Fund for the building of Schools in which Doctrines which you consider fundamentably incorrect are taught?

I should conceive that were I to answer the Question of the Board which relates to separate Religious Instruction in the Affirmative, coupled with the Circumstance of my having erected or aided to erect the Schoolhouse, my Conduct would be still more inconsistent and equivocal in relation to Duty.

Do you confine your Objection to Cases in which you have been called upon to assist in the building of Schools, or do you object to those built by Roman Catholics, and where the Roman Catholic Children are taught by their own Ministers?

If I may be allowed to explain my Meaning by Fact, I feel conscientious Difficulties against aiding in the Erection of Houses for the Inculcation of a System that I believe to be radically erroneous; and I do not generally ask Contributions from Persons attached to such Systems, lest I should be brought into the awkward Circumstance of having to refuse such Persons again.

The

The Committee refer to Houses for Schools?
The Principle, I apprehend, is of general Application.

Do you object generally to the System of Religious Instruction of Roman Catholics by their Pastors, and to be in union with a School which does that?
I do.

Will not the Consequence of that be, the Board being associated for general Instruction, an Impossibility of educating Protestants and Roman Catholics together, unless you deny Roman Catholics Religious Instruction in the Schools?
I believe it would not have that Tendency.

Why do you think the Religious Instruction of Roman Catholics might go on with the Adoption of the Principle you state?
I answer that Question in the Belief that no Religious Instruction should be given in Schools inconsistent with the Word of God.

You were asked to explain how it was that Religious Instruction could be given to Roman Catholic Children by Roman Catholic Teachers in consistency with the Rule you have laid down?
I have totally misunderstood the Question if that was the Meaning of it; will your Lordship put the Question again?

If the Principle is laid down that no conscientious Protestant, such as you are, can be a Party, in the Sense in which you use the Word "Party," to give Facilities for the teaching Roman Catholic Children the Principles of their own Religion by Roman Catholic Pastors, will not the Consequence of that be, that there cannot be a joint System of Education for the Protestants and Roman Catholics, and that it will shut out the Roman Catholics from Religious Education in their own Creed?
According to my View it will shut out Teachers of that System from the Opportunity of propagating it in the National Schools.

Would not that have the Effect of defeating the Scheme of joint National Education, unless by excluding the Roman Catholics?
My own Convictions in respect to the National System of Education are and have been, that from the heterogeneous Materials of Society, religiously viewed, in Ireland, it is, I might almost say, impracticable to bring all Parties together in One combined System of Education.

What do you understand by "religiously viewed, in Ireland"?
I speak of the Members of the different Religious Denominations, and their Attachments to their respective denominational Opinions.

Are you to be understood to say that you have decidedly recently come to the Opinion now that the Board of Education have not conceded the Point that was asked by the Synod?
That the Propositions, in the Spirit in which I view them, have not been granted.

Your Opinion is decided upon that?
Yes.

Are the Committee to understand, from the general Tenor of the Opinions you have now stated to them, that you object in general to Instruction being given in the Roman Catholic Religion to Roman Catholic Children, or that you only object to Protestants being Parties to it?
To Protestants being Parties to it; I object to any Persons being taught those Principles.

Do you imagine that Roman Catholics could tolerate or partake in any System of Education with the Members of the Church of England or Presbyterians in which the Children of Members of the Church of England and of Presbyterians should be taught by their own Pastors, and the Roman Catholic Children should not be taught by theirs?
That of course will just be a Matter of Opinion.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

In 1834 you thought that the Commissioners of Education had agreed to the Terms of the Synod?
I did.

Did you think at that Time there was to be no Religious Instruction intended to be given to Roman Catholics?
I believed at that Time that the Government and the Board of Education would have conceded to us what is embodied in the Propositions of the Synod on that Point; and that we, under those Circumstances, might not have been bound to any Connexion, however indirectly, with the countenancing or affording Facilities to the Roman Catholic Instructors to enter into those Schools to inculcate their peculiar Religious System.

Even on the Day set apart, and at the Hours set apart?
That those Days should be occupied as all the other Days of the Week should be, and that those Opportunities should be dispensed with entirely.

What Ground had you for thinking that the Commissioners or the Government had consented to withdraw this Regulation?
The Information that the Propositions of Synod had been acceded to.

Were you at all in connexion with the Kildare Place Society?
I believe I was in correspondence with the Kildare Place Society about Twelve or Fourteen Years ago with respect to the building of a Schoolhouse, and never before or since, save on One or Two Occasions when I was employed to purchase some of their Books for lending Libraries.

From the Knowledge you have of the Regulations of the Kildare Place Society System, did you object to them?
I understood that there was every Facility afforded to Children of becoming acquainted with the Scriptures in the Schools of that Society, and that there was no Legislative Exclusion of the Scriptures from those Schools.

Were you aware that one of the Regulations of the Kildare Place Society was, that the Clergy of different Persuasions should be allowed or required to educate their Children on particular Days exclusively?
I was not aware of that Circumstance.

If you had been aware of it, your Objection would have applied to the Kildare Place Society as well as to the National Board?
The Principle is the same, I conceive.

And you would have equally objected to it?
Of course.

Would the Principle you have now announced go this Length, that you think it would be much better that Persons should have no Religion at all than that they should have the Roman Catholic Religion?
I am not prepared to give an Answer to that Question. Charity is a Principle which I, as a Presbyterian, am disposed to countenance and encourage; an opposite Course would bind me to sit in Judgment in a Way I am not prepared for.

Are you satisfied with the System of the Kildare Place Society, because the free Use of the Scriptures was adopted in their Schools?
I am not able to enter into the Merits of the Kildare Place Society, never having had any Connexion whatever with that Society; the very little Correspondence I had with it relative to a Schoolhouse occurred Twelve or Fourteen Years ago.

Should you be satisfied with a System of Education which allowed of the free Use of the Scriptures in the Schools?
Of course, if consistent with the Views I have expressed.

Would you be satisfied with that System of Education just adverted to, even if any Roman Catholic Person was allowed, at stated Hours, to instruct Roman Catholic Children in the Doctrines of their own Religion?
My own conscientious Feeling is opposed to such an Arrangement being Part of a National System. I give my individual Opinion.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Do you mean to say the Synod of Ulster hold the Opinions you have individually expressed with respect to the Instruction of Roman Catholics?

I wish to be understood that it is my Desire that no Parties should be implicated in my Answers, or bound to the Opinions I now express, merely because I express them; I give my own conscientious Convictions.

The Second Proposition is, "That it shall be the Right of all Parents to require of Patrons and Managers of Schools to set apart, for reading the Holy Scriptures, a convenient and sufficient Portion of the stated School Hours, and to direct the Master or some other Person whom the Parents may appoint and provide to superintend the reading." Did you consider that by any Act of theirs the Board departed from the Concession implied by granting this Resolution?

The view which I understand to be taken by the Board of Education in reference to that Proposition is, that when the Scriptures are read in any of their Schoolhouses they are not read in School Hours, that is to say, in Hours recognized as School Hours by the Board.

Will you refer to the Third Proposition, "That all Children whose Parents and Guardians so direct shall daily read the Holy Scriptures during the Period appointed, but that no Compulsion whatever be employed to induce others either to read or remain during the reading?" Do you consider the Board to have departed from the Concession of that Proposition?

I understand that explained by the Answer I have last given.

You consider that the same Answer applies to that?

Yes.

Upon the Fourth Proposition, "That every Use of Schoolrooms be vested in the local Patrons of Committees, subject, in case of Abuse, to the Cognizance of the Board," do you understand the Board to have departed from the Concession of that Proposition?

If the Regulations of the Board still render it binding upon the local Patrons or Committees of the National Schools to make Arrangements for the Admission of Parties to teach Doctrines such as I have spoken of, I conceive that every Use of the Schoolrooms is not vested in the local Patrons or Committees in the Light in which I took the Concession to the Proposition.

Previous to the meeting of the Synod at Derry in 1834 had you opposed the System or favoured it?

I had opposed the System, and perhaps I may be permitted to add, I had joined my own Flock in sending forward a Petition in opposition to it to the Commons House of Parliament.

You adhered to the Resolutions at Cookstown, and you opposed the System on the Grounds therein stated?

Yes.

What induced you, at the Meeting at Derry in 1834, to join in considering that the Board had ceased to deserve Opposition?

The Circulars and Explanations which I had received.

What Circulars?

From the Board of Education.

Was Mr. Carlile's Circular one?

It was.

Did you consider that as one of the Circulars of the Board, or of him individually?

Of the Board, supported by the Recommendation of his Character going along with it.

Did you expect at that Time that the Roman Catholic Teachers would not be permitted to instruct the Roman Catholic Children in the Principles of their own Religion?

I expected at that Time that we should have been allowed the Sanction of the Board just upon the simple Principles embodied in our Four Propositions.

Do you mean the Synod apart from any other Arrangements?

Unfettered by Answers to Queries such as those I have alluded to.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Do you believe that the same Impression actuated other Members of the Synod who had opposed previously and now voted that the Board should be no longer opposed?
It may have done so, and perhaps did.

But you would rather not be considered as speaking for others?
Certainly.

Have you had much Experience in Education in Ireland?
I have been always very anxious to promote it.

Have you any Schools in your own District?
Yes, several.

Do you know how many Schools there are in the District in which you are a resident Minister?
Here I am very much at a loss for Documents; but I have come prepared with some Information upon that Subject; there are upwards of Twenty Day Schools in our District.

Do you mean of which you are the Superintendent of Religious Instruction?
No; many of which I visit.

Is there any other Minister associated with you in the Ministry of that District?
There are several Presbyterian Ministers who occasionally visit those Schools; there are also several Clergymen of the Church of England, and, I believe, Two Clergymen of the Secession Presbyterian Church, One Covenanting Minister, and several Gentlemen of the Roman Catholic Priesthood.

Are there any Schools in which the Scholars are solely of your Congregation?
I am not aware of there being any such School among us.

Of what other Religious Denomination are the Children who attend those Schools?
Of the Church of England, the Presbyterian Secession Church, of the Covenanting Church, and the Roman Catholic.

In all the Schools in your Parish are there Roman Catholic Scholars as well as Protestant Scholars?
I believe there are.

In the Schools peculiarly yours is that the Case?
I believe so.

What is the Proportion of the Roman Catholic Population of your District to the Protestant Population?
I have paid very particular Attention to those Subjects, and I believe I can state the Proportion in the Two Parishes with which my Ministry is more especially concerned; the Population of the Parish of Kilrea is, I believe, 4,262 Souls.

How are they distributed as to Religious Denomination?
There are of the Church of England 731, of the Synod of Ulster 1,362, of Covenanters 110, of the Presbyterian Secession Church 62, and of the Roman Catholics 1,997 Souls.

Do you find in this Parish that the Proportion of Roman Catholics in your Schools is very considerably less than the Proportion to the Population of the District?
Speaking in general Terms, I believe there is a fair Proportion of Roman Catholics in each of those Schools.

By a fair Proportion do you mean that there is a Proportion equal to the Proportion of the Population?
I believe it is such as one should naturally expect from the Locality.

With

With regard to the other Part of the District, what is the Amount of the Population?

In the Parish of Tamlaght O'Crilly there are of the Church of England 1,538 Souls, of the Synod of Ulster 2,787, of Covenanters 298, of Presbyterian Secession Church 865, and Roman Catholics 4,735, making the whole Population of the Parish 10,223 Souls.

In the Schools in that Parish what is the ordinary Proportion of the Number of Roman Catholic Scholars?

The same as in the other, I believe.

You believe it to be in each equal to the Proportion your Population bears?

Yes, taking the Locality of the School into account.

Have you the actual Numbers of any one School by which you can ascertain that?

I here fail for Want of Documents. About Five or Six Years ago I made out, for my own Satisfaction and the Satisfaction of the Landed Proprietors connected with the Interest of that District, a statistical Report of almost all the Schools therein, showing, not merely the gross Number of Pupils in each School, but, so far as I could collect, the relative Proportions also of the Children of the different Religious Denominations taught in each; I am unable to quote from that Document now.

The Proportion of the different Denominations among the Inhabitants was at that Time about the same as it is now?

I should suppose about the same.

Do you not find that the Roman Catholic Population is increasing in proportion to the others?

We generally understand that it increases more rapidly.

Do you not find that the great Proportion of the Roman Catholics are among the poorer Part of the Population?

Generally.

Therefore that the Children of the Roman Catholic Population requiring Education is greater in proportion to the others than the general Population is?

The Circumstances of the District to which I refer are very peculiar; I believe the Necessity exists almost equally with reference to all Parties.

Can you give the general Result of the statistical Account you took of the Numbers in the School?

The Answer that my Documents should, I believe, enable me to give, would be agreeable to the Account I have already given of the Proportions.

That in the whole of that District in which you took an Account of the Children of different Religious Denominations it appeared that the Proportion of Children of the Religious Denominations in the Schools was about the same as the Proportion of their respective Denominations?

Yes, I should think so.

You took a statistical Account with a view of ascertaining those very Points?

The Leanings of my own Mind are to be very accurately informed on the whole of those Matters; that led me to institute the Inquiry; besides, I also wished to be able to furnish myself with Arguments to press upon the Landed Proprietary the Necessity of making Provision for a better Education of the Inhabitants of the District.

Were those Landed Proprietors to whom you refer Protestants or Roman Catholics?

The Landed Proprietors to whom I refer constitute one of the worshipful Companies of London. I am unable to draw the Distinction; some of them, I know, are Members of the Church of England; I believe all those Gentlemen whom I have met are so.

Rev H. W. Rogers.

If this was your Object in making out this statistical Account, you must pretty well recollect the Proportion that the Roman Catholics bear; were they near the Proportion of Half the Number of Children in the Schools?
I should think in several of the Schools they were, and perhaps they were more than Half in others; they might not have amounted to Half in some of the Schools, owing to the Locality.

Was there about a Half, taking the whole Average?
I believe there may have been; there was nothing to strike my own Mind to the contrary, so far as I remember.

Did the Roman Catholic Clergy in that District approve of the Children attending those Schools, or show any Opposition?
We have not met with much Opposition.

The Bible is freely used in those Schools?
It is.

In the Schools of which you are the Superintendent the Bible makes an important Part of the daily Instruction?
It does.

Are you of opinion that the Roman Catholic Children attend the Schools to which you have referred now in as great Numbers as they did at the Time you took that statistical Account Six Years ago?
I believe they do.

Do the Roman Catholic Children freely partake of the Instruction in reading the Bible?
Very freely.

Do they get it by Heart all?
I have sometimes been amazed at the Quantities committed to Memory by almost all the Children in those Schools who are able to read; and I believe in some Instances the Roman Catholics have committed the Scriptures to Memory in much larger Quantities than others.

That they were more anxious than the others?
I merely state the Fact.

What is the Version you use?
The Authorized Version.

You never use the Douay in any of your Schools?
I am not aware of the Douay Version being used in any of the Schools; I believe it is used in none.

Was this known to the Roman Catholic Clergyman?
I believe so.

Do you know whether he has any Schools?
There are Two National Schools.

Besides those Two National Schools, has the Roman Catholic Priest any Schools?
I am not aware of any but Sunday Schools; I believe in the Two Roman Catholic Chapels there are Sunday Schools taught.

Do you happen to know whether the Scriptures are at all used in those Sunday Schools in the Roman Catholic Chapels?
I believe the Scriptures are read in one of them, or were some Time ago.

How long ago?
A very few Years ago.

Were you ever in one of those Schools?
I never was.

What Reason have you for believing that the Scriptures are read in those Sunday Schools of the Roman Catholics?
Occasionally, on a Sunday Evening, I have gone to a remote Distance in my Congregation,

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Congregation, after public Intimation, and assembled my own People there, and preached to them, and united with them in Worship. I remember on one of those Occasions, when travelling along the public Road, and meeting a considerable Number of Children proceeding in the Direction of a Roman Catholic Chapel which I had passed, who had Books in their Hands, feeling an Interest in them, I asked them where they were going; they mentioned that they were going to their Sunday School in the Chapel, and I believe they mentioned to me that it was the Scriptures they were carrying with them, to read there.

Did you examine any of the Books?
I did not.

Have you found, since the National Schools have been instituted, that any Roman Catholics have been withdrawn from your Schools?
I am not aware that any have.

Are those Schools assisted by the National Board well attended by the Children in that District?
I am not able to answer that Question; I dare say they are.

Then if that is the Case there must have been a Want of further Means of Education for the Children of those Districts, if you have lost none, and those additional Schools are well attended?
The National Schools established in the District are almost solely, I believe, attended by the Children of Roman Catholics; One of them I might say solely is.

Were those Districts too far for the Children to attend your School before?
They were at an inconvenient Distance.

You do not consider that they were set up as opposition Schools to yours, but to supply a Want which existed before?
I am not aware of the Motive; I should hope Education was the Object.

Have you any Political Feeling that would be likely to sway you one way or another in your Estimate of this System?
I believe that I have very little of Political Feeling; if I have a Political Feeling it is decidedly opposed to the Demonstrations of Irish Party Spirit.

In those Chapels in which you understand the Scriptures to be read at the Sunday School, have you the Means of knowing what Version of the Scriptures was used?
I should suppose the Roman Catholic Version.

Do you find that the Children of Roman Catholics attending your Schools are in general willing to receive Instruction in the Scriptures?
I do. We have a Sunday School taught in our own Place of Worship. I from Time to Time commence with the Classes No. 1, 2, 3, and so on, and examine them in succession on Sunday Morning before the Commencement of the public Religious Services of the regular Congregation. We have Roman Catholics in that School; some of them most eager to have an Opportunity of reading and acquiring a Knowledge of the Scriptures; they attend with the Approbation and full Knowledge of their Parents, and without any Solicitation being practised by me or by any Persons connected with our Religious Society.

Have you found the Roman Catholic Children more eager than the Protestant Children of acquiring Scripture Knowledge?
In Sunday Schools and Day Schools I should say as eager. I am not at present able to state the exact Number, but there was One Roman Catholic Child in one of our Schools that had got by Memory a Number of Chapters from the Scripture really astonishing; whole Books of the New Testament, I believe.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

If that Child had been compelled to read them Five or Six Hours a Day do you think his Eagerness would have been as strong?
No; I am opposed to Compulsion.

In what Part of Ireland is the District to which you refer?
In the County of Londonderry.

Is that a Part of the Country where the Feelings of Hostility between Protestants and Catholics are very rife?
There were very strong Feelings there when I went into the Neighbourhood.

Do those continue now?
I think they are greatly moderated.

Was there any Appearance of that among the Roman Catholic and Protestant Children in the Schools?
I should say very little.

Do you think their having mixed in the Schools in the Way in which you say they have has tended to modify that Feeling?
I am not prepared to give an Opinion upon that Subject. I could mention a Cause which I think has had an Effect; I have felt bound conscientiously to discountenance such Feeling. I have exposed myself to a great deal of Difficulty in consequence, but not without obtaining, as I believe, my Object to a considerable Extent.

Were the Means you took to attain that Object through the Schools, or independent of the Schools, by inculcating Feelings of Charity and Benevolence between the Children in the Schools?
By always inculcating, as a public Character, Feelings of Charity and Forbearance.

You stated that you were inclined to think you were in error in 1834 when you voted in favour of adhering to the Propositions of the Board of Education; have you any Doubt upon your Mind of your being in error in 1834 when you formed one of the Minority at the Derry Meeting?
I believe there is not the Freedom conceded and secured to the Parents of Children by the National Board which I then supposed, and I hold that Opinion without any Doubt.

Your Expression was, that you were inclined to believe, as if you were not quite sure?
According to the Means of Information I have enjoyed, I have no Doubt.

How long is it since you have altered your Opinion upon that Point?
I have held the Opinion that I expressed at Derry ever since that Period with very great Hesitation.

At what Period was it you changed that Opinion?
I cannot fix any particular Date.

You said in the early Part of your Examination that since the Appointment of this Committee your Mind had been turned more particularly to this Subject, and you had altered your Opinion; is that Alteration of Opinion so late as the Appointment of this Committee?
No, it is not.

What did you mean by stating that your Mind had been more particularly directed to this Subject since that Period?
I have been still more confirmed by soliciting and enjoying an Opportunity of inquiring and examining.

You have spoken of Covenanters; are they the same as the Cameronians in Scotland?
They are what we understand by that Name.

Are Bibles gratuitously distributed to the Boys in the Schools?
They are occasionally; I myself very rarely, if ever, have given Bibles gratuitously to Children connected with any except Sabbath Schools.

Rev. H. W. Rogers.

Have any Persons given Bibles gratuitously?
I believe they have been given as Rewards for committing large Portions of Scripture to Memory.

Have any been given to Roman Catholics?
I believe they are exceedingly anxious to get them, and they in some few Instances do get them as Rewards.

What is the greatest Number of Chapters you recollect any Roman Catholic Child to have learned?
The Number varies so much that it is impossible for me to state precisely; perhaps Forty, Fifty, or Sixty Chapters, and perhaps I might venture to say a great deal more.

In how long a Time?
Perhaps in Three Months.

You have stated just now that there were Two National Schools established at no great Distance from yours in which the Children were principally Roman Catholics; do you imagine that the Roman Catholic Children who come to your School come there out of Preference to your School over the National School, or because it happens to lie more convenient with respect to Distance from their Residence?
I believe that in several Cases our Schools are preferred by Roman Catholic Parents.

The Question refers to the Parents generally?
I cannot speak generally upon the Subject.

Have you a Roman Catholic Schoolmaster in any one of the Schools under your Care?
Several of the Schoolmasters and Schoolmistresses are Roman Catholics.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Are there any Points on which you were examined when you were here before on which you wish to offer Explanations?
There are.

Will you state what they are?
I was asked, had I Reason to suspect that Religious Instruction of either Protestants or Roman Catholics had been mixed up with the Moral and Literary Instruction; my Answer was, that I had no Reason to suspect it. That which I wish to subjoin is, that there have been Instances in which I had been informed that there had been such a Mixture.

Was that in only One Case?
I believe there have been more than One Case, although very few. Some occurred in the North, and some of them, I think, in the South and Midland Counties.

What was done?
I communicated immediately with the Correspondent, stating that they had violated the Rules by allowing Religious Instruction to be given during the Period of the general School Business; and that they must observe this Rule, or cease to be in connexion with the Board.

Do you mean to say you have not had many Instances of that Kind communicated to you?
I do. I believe that the Instances have been few during a successive Period of Five Years.

Have you any other Statements to make to the Committee with respect to your former Evidence?
There is another Point. I delivered my Evidence with respect to the Course

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

pursued in the Sub-Committee on Applications for Aid: I do not think that I stated that this Mode of Examination became more perfect as the Board became more experienced; that in the earlier Stages this Examination was not so perfect as it has been for the last Two Years. This I wish to add to my Answer upon that Point.

The Mode of Examination by whom?

By the Sub-Committee. I stated what our present Practice was, and what it had been for some Time; I did not state that before it had gained so perfect a Degree of Experience the Mode of Examination was less perfect.

Do you recollect the Circumstances of a School in the County of Down called the Annahilt School?

I recollect the School.

Can you state to the Committee any Circumstances respecting that School?

I cannot from present Recollection. I am not aware of what Circumstances are alluded to.

Have the Board in general been inclined to listen to the Application of the Patrons and Clergy of the Established Church, Dissenting Ministers, or any leading Person in the Parish; or have they been more inclined to listen to the Application of Persons of the lower Grade in the Parish?

Their Inclination, where they entertain an Inclination, is to listen to the Application of Persons of the higher Grade, particularly Clergymen. In their printed Rules they had stated that they would give the Preference to Applications signed by Clergymen.

Or those Laymen who had subscribed largely to the Erection of the Schools?

Certainly. The Wish of the Board has ever been to come into contact with the more respectable Part of the Country in which the School is situate; they are very anxious, upon every Opportunity, for that.

Is there any thing else you wish to explain?

Yes. With regard to an Answer respecting Nunnery Schools a Question was asked me, whether the Board had created any Nunnery Schools; now, as the Meaning which I attach to the Word create is "to bring or call into existence," I answered that Question in the Negative, because my Belief and Impression are, that all the Nunnery Schools aided by the Board were in existence before the Formation of the Board; but a Doubt has since then arisen on my Mind, whether the Noble Lord who put the Question may not have intended to use the Words "build Schoolhouses" instead of "create Schools," in which Case my Answer would have been a different one. This Question however I was not asked.

Did the Board give Aid to building such School-houses?

They have, but to the best of my Recollection in Four or Five Instances only.

Have there been Grants to Nunnery Schools for fitting up, or for School Requisites, or for the Payment of Mistresses?

There have been for all those Things; for fitting up, Salaries, and School Rent.

What was the Ground taken by the Board in making those Grants?

The Board in the Beginning of 1832, at a very early Period after their Formation, had a Conference upon this very Point with Lord Stanley, the Result of which was, that he considered it would be most useful to take those Schools into connexion with them; upon this Understanding the Board received Applications from those Schools equally as from any other Class of Schools.

When you said that the Board had not assisted in creating Nunnery Schools, what did you mean?

I meant this, that the Board had not collected the Children, and thus assisted in creating the School; that the School had existed before, and by its own Means; that the Children had already and for some Time been collected,

and

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

and under the Superintendence of its own Teachers, in some Schoolroom or other, before any Application had been made to the Board for its Assistance towards maintaining it.

You mean that they only assisted the Nunnery Schools which previously existed, but that on Application for Aid to build that Aid was given in the Instances mentioned?
Yes.

Have you any Documents prepared for the Use of the Committee?
I was desired to bring to the Committee the Query Sheets, which are the Forms of the Applications for and adopted by the Board, and also the Forms of Inspectors Reports.

Can you now deliver them in?
I can.

The same are delivered in. (*Vide Numbers* 1, 2, 3, *and* 4. *in an Appendix at the End of this Day's Proceedings.*)

Have you any thing further to produce?
I was desired to deliver the original Applications which were signed by certain Clergymen, Eighteen in Number, as set out in this List. I have now these original Applications.

They will be ready for Examination when wanted?
Yes.

Do you recollect any Application made to you by a Gentleman of the Name of Morrison residing at Bray?
I do.

Have the goodness to state what were the Circumstances of it?
I have the Application here. (*Producing the same.*)

Had you any Conversation with Mr. Morrison respecting the Genuineness of that Signature of his?
I had.

State what passed?
The Conversation I had with Mr. Morrison with respect to the Fact of his own Signature was in Substance this: he said he would not deny that his Name was in his own Handwriting, but that he had no Recollection of it.

You showed him his own Signature?
I did; he said he would not deny but that "Richard Morrison" was his own Handwriting.

In respect of the Signature of his Son's Name, what did he say?
With respect to that, he stated that it was not Mr. Fielding Morrison's Handwriting.

He denied it to be his Son's?
He did.

Did he say whether it was his own?
He doubted at first whether his own Name was in his own Handwriting; but before he left the Room he said he would not deny that it was his Handwriting.

Look at the Signature of the Son; does it appear to be in the same Handwriting with the Signature of the Father?
I think it appears to be written with the same Pen and the same Ink.

Did Mr. Morrison state whether the Son's Signature was applied by him or not?
No, he did not.

Do you recollect, after this passed, and the Son's Signature being shown, any Message being sent requesting the Attendance of the Son?
I wrote to the Son, stating that his Name was attached to the Query Sheet, and requesting he would come, and I would show it him, in order that he might judge of the Handwriting, whether it was genuine or not.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Did he come?
No, he has never come.

Richard Morrison is Richard Morrison the Architect?
He is.

Did he deny that was his Handwriting?
He at first doubted whether it was his own Handwriting or not, but before the Conversation ended he admitted it might be his, and that he could not say it was not his.

This was in Conversation with Mr. Morrison?
Yes.

Subsequently to that Conversation did you receive any written Minute from Mr. Morrison of what had passed in that Conversation?
I received Notes from Mr. Morrison, which I hold in my Hand.

Will you read them, in order that the Committee may see the Effect of them?
Yes. This is from Morrison the elder; it is dated the 21st of February, and received by me upon the 23d of February 1836:—"My dear Sir, I communicated to my Son the Subject of the Note with which you favoured me, in which you say 'that you find the Name of Mr. Fielding Morrison in an Application made so long back as February 1833 to the Board for the Dargle National Schools.' In my Conversation with you I referred to a Statement made of his having certified for a School in the Parish of Delganey; and you will perceive by my Son's Note to you that he never certified or in any Manner interfered in either of those Instances. I conclude that you must have intended to say Delganey when you wrote Dargle. May I now give the Trouble to inquire if such was the Case?"

Was the Conversation that took place of which you have spoken subsequent to the Receipt of that Note you have now read?
I think the Conversation was subsequent.

Did you receive after that Conversation a Note from him which purported to state what had passed in the Conversation, that there might be a Record?
This is the only Note I afterwards received, dated February 25th. Your Lordships will judge of its Import.

On what Day was the Conversation?
I should think the Conversation must have been upon the 24th.

Then in fact it was not on the 25th?
I cannot be certain, but should think it was not.

It was subsequent to the 23d?
I think it was. Perhaps Circumstances may bring the Date more clearly to my Mind, but I cannot charge my Recollection precisely with the Day. Mr. Carlile however was present at the Conversation, and if my Memory may fail his may serve as to this Point.

The Conversation was subsequent to the 23d, and this Letter was subsequent to the Conversation?
As to the Day of the Conversation I cannot at this Moment be more precise; but this Letter of the 25th, which I am about to read, was subsequent to the Conversation.

Do you mean to say that the Conversation was not subsequent to the Note you have already read?
I cannot be more precise. My Recollection is rather of the Substance of the Facts, and not of any minor Matters. It might have been as well before as after the Note I have read.

Have the goodness to read the Second Note?
"February 25th. My dear Sir,—My Son regrets his Inability to write to you himself, as he is suffering from severe Indisposition. He desires me to say, that having no Desire on the Subject of my Communication with you Yesterday, further than what his Note to you has expressed, he can only now repeat his

T. I. Kelly, Esq.

his Assurance that he did not sign his Name to any Application for a School in the Parish of Delganey, nor did he ever authorize any Person to do so for him. As to the Signature of my Name to the Application, I beg to repeat what I told you, that I have not the most distant Recollection of any Circumstance connected with the Transaction; but I will say, that, residing in the Neighbourhood, and having very favourable Opinions of the School in question, I would not have refused my Signature were an Application made to me for it."

Have the goodness to read that Note now shown to you, and say whether you ever received a Note to that Effect?

" My dear Sir,—I represented to my Son, Mr. Fielding Morrison, as I told you I would do, all that occurred in my personal Communication with you this Day. He regrets that the severe Indisposition under which he is suffering precludes the Possibility of his calling upon you; and he desires me to assure the Commissioners of Education, through you, that he never attached his Signature to the Document in question, nor did he ever authorize any Person to do so for him; and so far was he from interfering on this Occasion, that he refused (as I told you he had done, to my Knowledge,) to certify an Application to the Board for a School in his own Parish. For myself, I can only now repeat what I already told you, that I have no Knowledge or Recollection of having ever given my Signature to this Document, or of having ever been applied to for such a Purpose. It is however but fair in me to add, that having favourable Opinions of Messrs. Grattan's School, which is in my Neighbourhood, I think it probable that were I applied to for the Purpose of certifying that Approval I would not have refused it, although I certainly would not give my Signature to any Document intended to place the School under the Irish Education Board. I beg to add, that I write this Note to you to prevent the Possibility of any Mistake as to what occurred in our Interview this Day." I never received such a Note.

What is the Date of the Note?
It is Tuesday; there is no further Date.

Did you state to any of the Commissioners the Communication which had taken place between you and Mr. Morrison?
Mr. Carlile was present at it; I conversed with him on it.

Did you state it to any other Commissioner?
Certainly.

To whom? Did you state it to Mr. Blake?
I stated it to Mr. Blake.

Did you state this to any Commissioner who was preparing the Third Report?
Certainly.

At the Time it was preparing?
Certainly.

Were those the only Two Commissioners who were, to your Knowledge, cognizant of this?
No; I mentioned it to the Board.

Previous to the Third Report?
Yes.

While that Third Report was in preparation?
Yes, while the Third Report was in preparation.

It was before they drew up the Third Report?
I made the Statement so as to refresh their Memory when alluding to the Fact.

Have the goodness to read the Two Paragraphs now put before you, of the Third Report?

" We must now state, and we shall show on what Grounds we state, that we have not the slightest Doubt that the Name of Mr. Morrison was put to the Application in question either by himself or by his Father. The Person who

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

was collecting Signatures to the Application avers that he took it to Mr. Morrison's Father, who lives in the immediate Neighbourhood of the School, for his Signature, and that the Father returned it with his own and his Son's. Mr. Morrison the Father came to our Office on the Subject a few Months ago, and at first said that he knew nothing of the Application; when however his Signature to it was shown to him in his known Handwriting, he said that he could not deny that it was his, but that he had no Recollection of the Matter. Mr. Morrison the Son at the same Time wrote to us, positively denying that he either signed the Application or authorized any Person to do so. It is manifest however, on the Face of the Document, that his Signature and his Father's were written at the same Time and in the same Ink. His Signature too bears a striking Resemblance to the Handwriting of the Note which he wrote to us on the Subject. We therefore made a Request to him, through his Father, that he would call at our Office and look at it, but he has not thought proper to do so."

Is that Statement which is contained in the Third Report a true Statement, according to your Recollection, of what passed between you and Mr. Morrison, and according to the Report you made to the Board?

It is; also the Statement of the Manner in which the Application was got forward for the Board. I believe the whole to be correctly stated in the Report.

There is a Letter produced as if written by Mr. Morrison subsequent to the Two Letters which have been read; you have already said no such Letter ever reached you?

No, it did not.

There is no Evidence that you are aware of that such a Letter as that enclosed in Mr. Morrison's Letter to the Bishop of Exeter ever was sent to you?

None.

You consider that that Letter must have been a Contrivance of Mr. Morrison's to represent his Opinions to the Person to whom he sent that Letter in a Way he thought would be agreeable?

That is a Question I cannot answer.

Do all the Letters come addressed to you?

They do.

Is there any Person in the Office who opens Letters?

No; I open all the Letters myself.

Have you any Reason to believe that such Letter ever was sent to you?

I have not. The Letter of the 25th, which I read to the Committee, seemed to be the Conclusion or winding-up of all this Business.

That Letter contains a good deal of the same as is in the other Letter, but not an Expression of his Disapprobation?

Just so. The Letter of the 25th expresses no Disapprobation of the National System; this, on the contrary, does, although purporting to relate to the same Transaction, and at the same Period of Time.

Is this the only Instance in which a Letter has been brought to your Attention purporting to be addressed to you as the Organ of the Board, and which you have in point of fact never received?

It is the first and only Instance.

You have said that you consider these Two Paragraphs of the Report you have read to be a true Statement of the Facts?

Yes, I conceive they are. It is manifest, on the Face of the Document, that the Signatures of Mr. Morrison the Son and Mr. Morrison the Father were written at the same Time and in the same Ink. The Report proceeds to say that the Signature to the Application bears a strong Resemblance to the Handwriting of the Note written to us on the Subject.

Will you produce the Letter Mr. Morrison the Son wrote to you?

[The Witness produces the same. *See Fac-simile, p. 230.*]

Looking

Looking at this Handwriting and this Signature, do you say you think there is a striking Resemblance? *T. F. Kelly, Esq.*

It did strike me, and does now, that there is a Resemblance.

You persist in saying you think there is a Resemblance between the Two?

Yes; it struck me so, looking at the M, and at some other Parts of it, making an Allowance for the Difference of Ink and Paper, and perhaps the Hand was in a cooler State, but this is a Matter of Opinion altogether.

You say, "we therefore made a Request to him through his Father, that he would call at our Office and look at it, but he has not thought proper to do so;" are not you aware that the Father or the Son gave a Reason why he did not call at your Office?

He did.

What is the Reason?

That Reason is contained in the Note of the 25th: "My Son regrets his Inability to write to you himself, as he is suffering from severe Indisposition."

Would it not have been fair that that should have been stated, under the Circumstances?

The Question which was asked was, "Whether the Statement in the Report was a true Statement?" As to the Judiciousness of it I must be excused passing a Judgment.

What you stated was, that it was a fair Statement as far as Facts and Truth go?

Yes.

Not applying to any of the Terms employed, but to the Facts stated?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday the 6th of April next.

215

Select Committee on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Die Martis, 21° Martii 1837.

THE LORD PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR.

The following Letter was delivered in & read.

Dear Sir,

A communication was made to me lately from the Revd Mr Cleaver Rector of Delgany, stating that my Name had been returned to Parliament by the National Education Board, as having applied for the assistance of the Board in establishing a School in that Parish —

As I have had any communication with the Parish of Delgany or with any other Parish in

To face page 231.

in the Diocese, I never did
interfere in any way with it's
Concerns - If Thompson, an applicate
has been made to the Board
in My Name to establish a
School in that Parish, it was
done without My authority or
even My Knowledge, and I
think it due to Mr Cleaver to
the Education Board and to
Myself, thus to contradict it.
I have the honor to be
Dear Sir
Your very obedient Servant
Fielding Morrison
Vicar of Horsmonden
J. O'Kelly Esq
Secretary to the Nat. Education Board.

Richard Morrison
Fred.k Morrison Clerk

Appendix to the Proceedings of the 21st March 1837.

No. 1.

Queries to be answered by Applicants for Aid towards the building of Schoolhouses.

1. In what Townland, Parish, and County is it proposed to build the Schoolhouse;—what is the Name and Distance of the nearest Post Town, and in what Direction?

2. Has Ground, affording a commodious Site for building, been obtained?
   If so, from whom, and by what Tenure?
   Is it in Church or Chapel Yard?
   Is it in connexion with any Religious Establishment?
   If so, has Inquiry been made as to any other Site, and what has been the Result of the Inquiry?

3. Is the Ground liable to any and what Rent?

4. What is the estimated Expense of the Building, and what are its Dimensions?

5. Is it contemplated to appropriate Part of the Building to the Purpose of a House or Apartments for the Master, or for any other Object? If so, specify particularly what Part or Parts, and the Amount thereof in the Estimate separately?

6. Has any and what Progress been made in the Building; and what is the estimated Expense of finishing it?

N.B.—In addition to the Answers to those Queries, the Commissioners will require to be furnished with a Plan *and* Estimate *of the Building.*

7. Has any and what Sum of Money been actually contributed towards the Building? and if so, state where the same is lodged, and in whose Name?

8. In the event of Aid being granted, will One Day, at least in the Week, exclusive of Sunday, be set apart for the Religious Instruction of the Children by the Clergy or others approved by the Parents?

9. Will you take care that no Children be present at any Religious Instruction or Exercise except those whose Parents consent to their being present?

10. How many Days in each Week, and how many Hours in each Day, will be allotted to a Literary and Moral Education, including Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, and History?

See Rules of Commissioners of Education.

11. Will care be taken to have a Register kept in the School recording the daily Attendance of the Pupils,—the average Attendance of each Week, and of the Weeks in each Quarter?

12. Will no Books be used in the School during the Hours of common Education, but such as are sanctioned by the Board?

13. Will you consent to dismiss any Teacher to whom the Commissioners shall decidedly object, and to provide another?

14. If any Teacher die or be removed, will you take care that such Change be reported immediately to the Board?

15. Have the Clergymen of the different Denominations in the Parish, or in the Neighbourhood of the School, been applied to in order to obtain their Co-operation and their Signature to this Application?

Answer this specifically.

16. Will the Inscription "NATIONAL SCHOOL" be put up conspicuously on the Schoolhouse?

17. If the Commissioners object to any particular Use of the Schoolhouse on Sundays, or out of the School Hours on Week Days, as an Abuse, or as tending to Contention, will such Use of the Schoolhouse be given up?

18. Will a Copy of the General Lesson be hung up in the School, on your being furnished with it by the Board?

19. Will Access be given to Clergymen of all Denominations to visit the Schools in the Manner set forth in the Regulations?

20. As the Commissioners require that the Schoolhouse when finished shall be vested in Trustees for Maintenance of the System of Education set forth in the above Answers, to be approved of by them, state the Names and Address of the Trustees in whom the Building may be already vested; or if not already vested, of the Persons in whom it is proposed to vest the same?

N.B.—The Trusts must be distinctly declared. The Property must continue in the original Trustees; or be vested, when necessary, in others, to be approved of by the Commissioners, upon the original Trusts. Power of Exchange and of Appointment of new Trustees is given, subject to the Approval of the Commissioners.

21. What Number of Children may be expected to attend the School, distinguishing Males and Females, and what are the Circumstances and the Population of the Parish? Males. Females.

22. State specifically the Names and Number of Schools in the Parish or Neighbourhood, and of what Description and under whose Patronage or Direction, and at what Distance respectively from this intended Schoolhouse?

23. Are there any Persons, resident in Dublin, acquainted with the Circumstances of this Application? If so, state their Names and Address?

The Nature and Extent of the Aid required is as follows:

We, the undersigned, request the above Aid from the Commissioners of National Education, believing the Queries to be fully and truly answered, and engaging that the School shall be conducted according to the Regulations set forth in our Answers.

Protestants.	*Roman Catholics.*

By Desire of the Commissioners,
THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary.

No. 2.

QUERIES to be answered by Applicants for Aid towards the fitting up of Schools, the paying of Teachers, and the obtaining of School Requisites.

The Answers are expected to refer, not to what may be the present Rules of conducting the School, but to the Mode it is intended to conduct it, in the event of its receiving Aid from the Board.

1. What is the Name of the School, and when was it established?
2. In what Townland?
   Parish?
   County?
3. What is the Name and Distance of the nearest Post Town, and in what Direction?
4. State particularly whether the School is or has been in connexion with or has derived Aid from any other Society; and if so, the Name of the Society, the Amount of the Aid received, the Nature of the Connexion, and whether that Connexion is to continue?
5. State whether the Schoolhouse is attached to, or erected upon, Church or Chapel Ground?
   Or whether it is in connexion with any Religious Establishment?
   Of what Materials is it built?
   Is it thatched or slated?
   What are its Dimensions?
   From what Funds was it erected?
   Who pays the Rent for it?
   Is the whole House exclusively employed for the Scholars?
   If not, who else uses it, or dwells therein?
   What is the Number of Rooms used as Schoolrooms, and their Dimensions?
   In what State of Repair is the Schoolhouse?
   What Number of Desks and Seats are there in the Schoolroom, and how many Children do they accommodate?
6. What are the Sources from whence the annual Income of the School is derived, and what is the Amount of such Income?
7. What Arrangement is made respecting the imparting of Religious Instruction to the Children?
   State particularly what Day or Days of the Week are set apart for that Purpose, and what Hour or Hours on any other Day?
   State also whether public Notification is given of this Arrangement, and whether or not Parents are left at liberty to withhold their Children from Religious Instruction which they do not approve of?
8. How many Days in each Week are employed in instructing the Children in the common Branches of Moral and Literary Education, and how many Hours in each Day; and state particularly at what Hour School commences, and when it closes?

See Rules of the Commissioners of Education.

9. Is a Register kept in the School, recording the daily Attendance of the Children, and the average Attendance of each Week and each Quarter?
10. How many Children have been present on the Average every Week, for the last Quarter of a Year? Males. Females.
11. Do you expect any Increase, and to what Extent?
12. Are you disposed to use the Books prepared and issued by the Board? If not, state the Titles of those Books which you purpose to use.

13. State the Names of the present Teacher or Teachers?
Have they been educated at any and what Model School?
What Testimonials can they produce of Fitness for their Office?
What is the Amount of Salaries paid to them, and whence derived? Do the Scholars pay any thing, and what?

14. Have the Clergymen of the different Denominations in the Parish, or in the Neighbourhood of the School, been applied to in order to obtain their Signatures to this Application; if not, state the Cause?

15. Is the School under the Direction of any Individual or Individuals or a Committee? State the Name and Address of the Individual or Individuals; if a Committee, state the Name of the Treasurer, Secretary, or Correspondent, and his Post Town?

16. What other Schools are there within Three Miles of yours? State their Names, particularly whether National Schools, and at what Distance they are. State also under what Patronage and Direction they are?

17. What is the Population of the Parish?

18. Are there any Persons resident in Dublin acquainted with the Manager or the Circumstances of this School; if so, state their Names and Address?

19. Will a Copy of the Lesson contained in the Regulations, No.VI., be hung up conspicuously in the School, and the Import of it carefully inculcated on the Children?

20. Will Access be given to the Clergy of every Denomination to enter the Schoolroom as Visitors, provided they take no Part in the Business of the School, or interrupt it?

If Furniture or Repairs of the Schoolhouse be asked, the Commissioners will require to see a Ground Plan and Elevation of the Schoolhouse, with Estimates of the Expense in detail. In all Cases they will be glad to receive Plans and Elevations of the Schoolhouses.

The Nature and Extent of the Aid required is as follows:

Specify in detail Repairs or Furniture, &c.

We, the undersigned, request the above Aid from the Commissioners of National Education, believing the Queries to be fully and truly answered, and engaging that the School shall be conducted according to the Regulations set forth in our Answers.

Protestants. | *Roman Catholics.*

By Desire of the Commissioners,

THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary.

No. 3.

A.D. 1835.

REPORT upon ———— Applicant School,

Situate *Miles from* *in the Parish of* *County*
of *of* *Post Town* *Patron.*
Visited on the *Day of* *and examined into from* *o'Clock*
to *o'Clock.*

Teacher, aged *Years,* *Trained.*
Teacher, aged *Years,* *Trained.*

Scholars.

	Present at the Time of Inspection.	On the Books for the last Six Months.	Average Attendance for the last Six Months.
Males - -			
Females - -			
Total -			

The Numbers present were learning the following Branches.

Spelling and Reading.	No.	Writing.	No.	Extra Branches.	No.
Alphabet - -		Learning to write -			
		Writing on Paper -			
Monosyllables -		ARITHMETIC.			
		First Four Rules -			
Polysyllables -		Reduction and Compound Rules -			
Good Readers -		Rule of Three and above			

1. Has the School been heretofore under the Patronage of any and what Society or Individuals, and for what Length of Time?
2. What Funds or Benefit did it derive therefrom?
3. Does that Connexion still continue?
4. Are these Patrons aware that Application has been made on behalf of this School to the Commissioners of Education? If so, is it with their Approbation?
5. If they are not aware, or do not approve, state the Reasons?
6. Has this Application been got up by the Teacher or his Friends, or for his Benefit exclusively?
7. What is the Character of the Teacher, and his Age?

8. Describe the Schoolhouse?
Where situate?
Of what Materials is it built?
How many Rooms?
Of what Dimensions each Room?
Who pays the Rent for it?

9. Does the Teacher dwell in it?

10. Does the School appear to be conducted with Efficiency?

11. State the Amount of his Income, and from what derived?

12. Does a Necessity exist for the building of a new Schoolhouse here? State your Reasons in your Reply?

13. What is the Number of National Schools within Three Miles of proposed Schoolhouse, and what their several Distances from it?

14. Describe the Site, and the Length of Tenure?

15. If on Ground connected with any House of Divine Worship, from what Necessity has this arisen?

16. What Efforts have been made to overcome such Necessity?

17. What is your Opinion as to the Dimensions of the proposed Building, and as to the Estimate?

18. Have the Clergymen of the different Denominations been consulted as to making any Arrangement for giving Religious Instruction in the School should it become a National one? If so, state it?

19. State your Opinion upon the entire of this Application, and upon what Grounds it should either be entertained or rejected?

N.B.—To the Inspector:—If the Application be for Aid to build, the Queries 8, 9, 10, and 11. are not to be answered, but in their Place the Queries 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

, Inspector.

No. 4.

A.D. 1836.

REPORT upon ———— National School,

Situate Miles from in the Parish of Townland of Co. of of Post Town Correspondent. Visited on the Day of and examined into from o'Clock until o'Clock.

Scholars.

	Present at the Time of Inspection.	On the Books for the last Six Months.	Average Attendance for the last Six Months.
Males - -			
Females - -			
Total -			

The Numbers present were learning the following Branches.

Lesson Books.	No.	Arithmetic, &c.	No.	Writing.	No.
Book, No. 1. - -		First Four Rules -		Writing on Slates -	
Do. No. 2. - -		Compound Rules and Reduction -		Do. on Paper -	
Do. No. 3. - -		Proportion, and above		BRANCHES for FEMALES.	
Do. No. 4. - -		Book-keeping -		Sewing - -	
Do. No. 5. - -		Mensuration -		Knitting - -	
Scripture Extracts -		Geometry - -		Straw Platting -	

Days for general Instruction.	Number of Hours each Day.

Day set apart for Religious Instruction.	Hour on each other Day (if any).	Religious Instructors, distinguishing their Denominations.

NAMES of the TEACHERS.

Male.		Female.	
aged	*trained.*	*aged*	*trained.*
aged	*trained.*	*aged*	

1. Is the Inscription "National School" conspicuously on the Outside of the Schoolhouse, and is the General Lesson hung up within?

2. Is the School furnished with a Copy of School Rules? Are they filled up in strict Accordance with the Regulations of the Commissioners, and is the School so conducted?

3. What are the Vacations?

4. Is the free Stock of Books in the School? State its Amount, if there be an Entry of it in the Report Book, and if any additional Supply be necessary. State by Name what other Books are in the School?

		FREE STOCK.	
——	Tablet Lessons		—— Sacred Poetry.
——	Lesson Book,	No. 1.	—— Arithmetical Tablets.
——	Do.	2.	—— Arithmetic.
——	Do.	3.	—— Key to do.
——	Do.	4.	—— Book-keeping.
——	Do.	5.	—— Key to do.
——	Scripture Lessons,	(O.T.) 1.	—— Geometry.
——	Do.	(N.T.) 1.	—— Mensuration.
——	Do.	(N.T.) 2.	—— Set Copy Lines

5. Is there any thing in the Aspect or Regulations of the School, which tends to confine it to any one Denomination of Children? If so, describe it.

6. Are the Accounts of the Proficiency and Attendance of the Scholars kept correctly?

7. Does the School appear to be conducted with Efficiency?

8. State your Opinion of the Teachers?

9. What is the Amount of the Income of the Teachers, and whence derived?

10. State the Rates of Payment. Are any, and what Number of Children, admitted gratuitously, and by whose Recommendation?

11. On what Subjects did you leave Memoranda for the Teacher's Attention? How many Classes in the School? Did you examine them all?

12. State the Subject of your Interview with the Manager or Corspondent?

13. Have the Grants made by the Commissioners been entered in the Report Book, and have they, in your Opinion, been expended judiciously?

14. State whether the Schoolhouse is secured by Lease or otherwise, for the Purpose of Education, and to whom? From what Funds was the Building erected, and who pays the Rent for it?

15. Description of House.
Is it on Church, Chapel, or Meeting House Ground, or connected with any House of Divine Worship?
Materials built of?
Dimensions, Length, Breadth, and Heighth?
Light and Ventilation?
What Apartments are for Schoolrooms, and their Dimensions?
Are there Apartments for Teacher?
How many Desks and Forms are there?
Of what Length is each?

16. What Suggestions were entered in the Report Book by the former Inspector? Have they been attended to?

17. Has this School improved or retrograded since the former Inspection, and state the Particulars?

18. State the Number and respective Distances from this School of National Schools within Three Miles.

19. State such other Circumstances, relating to the School, or the State of Education in the surrounding Neighbourhood, as you may deem necessary?

N.B.—When you state in this Report a Violation of the Rules of the Commissioners of Education, state also, if you have corrected it.

, Inspector.

Die Jovis, 6° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Did you understand the Committee that you were not to alter what you had said, excepting Words; but that, if necessary, you were to explain, and that you were called the last Day to explain your Evidence?

Yes; I understood I was called the last Day to explain.

There is an important Answer given by you, which you afterwards explained; but on the 13th of March this Question was put to you: "Have you known any Instance of the Board giving Aid to Buildings for Schools in Monasteries; you have said that you have not in Nunneries; have you in Monasteries?" The Answer, as given at that Time, was this: "No, not to my Knowledge." Now, have the goodness to observe, in the printed Evidence, in Page 101, it appears thus: "No Question has been put to me respecting building Schoolhouses in Nunneries, but only about creating Schools; as to Monasteries there is no Instance to my Knowledge or Recollection." You will perceive that must have been altered subsequently?

Certainly it was. Your Lordship is quite correct in drawing my Attention to the Difference between the Two; I certainly did insert those Words in Writing previous to their being printed. When the Evidence was given to me to be corrected I did not think there was any Injunction against my altering that, as it was not against the Sense of the Answer; and I considered myself, when altering that, to be equally under the Obligation of my Oath as when I gave the original Answer.

You have corrected your Answer not merely in Words, but very importantly in the Sense; you have put a new Fact before the Committee; no Question having been put to you respecting building Schools in Nunneries, but only about creating Schoolhouses, you applied to the Committee to be allowed to explain your Evidence?

I did.

You were told that Explanation was the right Way of doing it, and not Correction in the Manuscript; do not you recollect that?

I do not recollect the latter Part of that which your Lordship has said; but I did apply to the Committee for Leave to explain my Evidence, and I stated that that was One of the Points on which I was very anxious to do so.

Did you make that Correction subsequently to your giving your Explanation in this Room?

No; I had made that Correction before that.

Why did not you state that you had done that?

Till this Moment I did not know that what I had done was irregular, and I considered myself when doing it as still under the Obligation of an Oath.

Supposing that to have stood as it now stands in print, what had you to explain?

I think I did not make it so fully as I could wish.

Have the goodness to show what there was which still remained to be explained?

The Answer is here, "No Question has been put to me respecting building Schoolhouses in Nunneries, but only about creating Schools; as to Monasteries,

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

there is no Instance to my Knowledge or Recollection." I wished to explain to the Committee what creating Schools meant.

Was that Correction made after Communication with any other Person?
No, it was not; it was made altogether from my own Impulse. It was on passing Home from the Committee I was revolving in my Mind the Question which had been put, and I found that the Question assumed that I had said that which I had not said, that was about building in Nunneries, and after that I made the Correction, and sought that the Committee would allow me to speak more fully, so that my Correction should not appear to have been a surreptitious one.

Have you a List of the Schools built on Chapel Ground?
I have it in Town, but not with me.

Have you in your Office an Account of every School kept separate, so that you can readily turn to it?
Yes.

You may remember that in the Second Report there were certain Estimates made of the probable Expenditure on the Extension of the Schools?
I do.

Have you got in the Office of the Board any Memoranda of the Data on which your Estimate was founded?
No.

Was it made without any Data?
Not without any Data; it was made by the Commissioners upon the Average of the present Expense of their existing Establishments, and the probable Increase those Establishments, when enlarged, would occasion.

They did it upon the probable Increase of Numbers?
The Expenditure necessary for the Number of Schools to be erected was calculated upon the present Mode of calculating the Expenditure for Schools, but not so strictly.

You were desired to produce an Account of the Charge and Discharge for the Year ending 31st March 1836?
I have not yet received it; it is in progress of Preparation.

Why was not it presented with the Annual Report?
It was not made up; the Account itself, however, is in the Audit Office, and has been there some Months.

The former Report gave the Charge and Discharge up to the 31st of March 1835; why did not the Annual Report of 1836 contain that Account, that being specially regarded in my Lord Stanley's Letter; why was not it made up with the Annual Report?
I think it was merely from Omission, and not from any other Cause.

Are you confident that nothing but Omission was the Cause?
I am.

Do you make up the Report, or the Commissioners?
The Commissioners; and that Year's Account, with all the necessary Vouchers, is and has been for some Four or Five Months in the Audit Office in London, the regular Office for auditing our Accounts; so that, although it had not been attached to the Report for the Reason alleged, yet it has not been kept back from the proper Audit Office.

You are understood to say that the Delay is not with the Board, but with the Audit Office in London?
No, I do not state that; what I state is this: the Account for the Year ending 31st of March 1836 is and has been for some Months in the regular Audit Office in London; the Circumstance of the Charge and Discharge not being annexed to the Report of 1836 can only have originated from Omission, not from any intended or other Cause.

You will perceive that the Charge and Discharge of that Year must have been much more tardily sent to London last Year than usually, if it has been

247

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

been in London only a few Months. How many Months has it been in London?

I should think from August or September last.

You will perceive in the Appendix to the Second Report, the Charge and Discharge ending the 31st of March 1835 had been over here, had been audited, had been returned, and was presented in the Report bearing Date the 13th of June 1835?

I imagine that that Abstract of the Charge and Discharge to the Report of 1835 was given before the Accounts in detail were sent to the Audit Office in 1835, and the same Thing might have been done with the Account of the Year 1836.

Do you think there is any Probability of an early Exhibition of that Account of Charge and Discharge?

I am surprised it has not been sent to me from the Office in Dublin; I know no Reason why it had not been sent to me in due Course immediately after I had written for it.

You do not consider it necessary that it should go to the Audit Office before it is returned to Parliament?

No; I cannot say that I do. The Course is, at the Expiration of each Year, to send the Account of that Year in detail, with all the necessary Vouchers, to the Audit Office, in pursuance of the Act of Parliament regulating the Audit of the Public Accounts, and regulating it so strictly that this must be done within Three Months after the Expiration of each Financial Year, or otherwise the Act prohibits the Treasury from issuing to that Department which has not so rendered its Accounts any Money voted by Parliament for the subsequent Year. I mention this in order to show that the not annexing the Abstract of the Year's Accounts to this Report arose from a mere Omission.

Why was the Appendix to the Third Report so long delayed?

The main Cause, as I recollect and felt it myself, was the great Number of Returns in Tabular Forms which were required; and therefore a great deal of Attention upon the Part of the Clerks in my Office, and much Time and much Revision, were necessary before I could get it through the Office with a sufficient Degree of Correctness.

You are aware it was detained more than Six Months?

It was detained much longer than, consistently with my own Habits of Business, I wished it should be.

Do not you think there is this remarkable Inconvenience attending that Delay, which prevented the Possibility of that Investigation into the Particulars which might have taken place in the Half Year which was lost, and which did, in fact, take place with regard to former Reports?

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Witness is again called in, and the Question proposed.

I am not of course aware of that; your Lordships only can be aware of the Inconvenience arising from the Delay of the Papers alluded to.

There was no Design on the Part of the Board to prevent Investigation?

The very reverse; they have in every Instance courted and wished for Investigation.

An Order was made by the House of Lords, on the 10th of March 1835, for certain Returns; among them, of the Names of Clergymen who had received Aid for Schools under the Board, which Return was not made till July 1835; what was the Cause of that Delay?

I think, so far as I recollect, that was one of many Orders made by the House of Lords, calling also for certain Returns which had been made to the Houses of Parliament in the preceding Year, and which, after having been made in that Year, were, as I was given to understand, burnt by some accidental Fire. The Board, at the Time this Order of the 10th of March 1835

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

was forwarded to them (I am speaking now from Recollection), feeling that they were then about to make up their Report for the Year, which expired with that Month, were of opinion that they could give those Returns to the House by annexing the Matter of them in the Appendixes which they were to attach to their Report; and they had upon that Point a Communication with Sir William Gossett, stating, that being directed to make up their Report, and also to make Returns to those Orders, they considered that they would meet both Points at once by giving in with their Report Appendixes containing the Matter of those Orders. Under the Impression that this Arrangement was not objected to it was being acted on until it was subsequently perceived in the public Papers that these Returns were more peremptorily required; and until, in consequence, a more peremptory Order was sent to my Office, I had not moved in the Execution of the Order, as at first required, but for the Reasons just now stated.

Those now shown to you are the Returns; there is a List of them in the last Page?

No; those are not the Returns to which my Answer applied; I feel that I may therefore answer at a Disadvantage; there were other Returns of the same Year.

What was the Reason of those being delayed?

I cannot assign any other Cause than the great Pressure of Business in the Office, and my Anxiety to give them correctly; but I distinctly beg leave to negative any Intention to retard the Papers or to prevent Investigation.

Are you aware that the Board in their Third Report adduced this Return, though not made till July, as a Proof that there was no Intention of giving an undue Impression of the Number of Clergymen who were Applicants in the Second Report in June?

If your Lordship will show me the Passage I shall be obliged; I may perhaps otherwise answer on a Misconception. (*The Witness refers to the Passage.*) The Passage, I observe, is this: "We gave in a separate Return the Names of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Clergymen who had signed each Application, and it showed that several Persons had signed more than One. The same Fact was pointed out by a Member of our Board, who was examined on the Subject Matter of our Report before a Committee of the House of Commons in August last. We thus expressly showed that the Number of Signatures exceeded the Number of Persons who had applied to us for Aid."

Are you aware that the Board, in their Third Report, adduced this Return, though not made till July, as a Proof that there was no Intention of making an incorrect Representation in the Second Report in June?

I cannot at present answer that Question. If on another Occasion it is put, I will look into the Return so as to enable me to answer.

Before those Returns were made had it come to the Knowledge of the Board that strong Observations had been made in the House of Lords on the unaccountable Neglect of its Order of March preceding?

Not officially.

The Question does not refer to official Communication. Had you seen in the Public Prints that that was the Case, and was that the Reason of the Board making the Return at last?

That was not the Reason; their making the Return was in obedience to the Order of the House; the Reason of their hastening it was, finding that the House was pressing for it.

Will you refer to this List, which professes to be a List of Clergymen of the Established Church who have received Grants from the Board in aid of Schools, as stated by the Return made by the Board to an Order of the House of Lords of March 1835, that Return bearing Date the 8th of July, presented and ordered to be printed the 17th of July in the same Year, with Remarks on some of the Names of the Clergymen, stating the Number of Schools for which there were Applicants, as stated in the Second Report of the 3d of March

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

March 1835; will you go over that, and on a future Day either verify or contradict the Statements there made?

I will do so.

Will you refer to List No. 5. of the Appendix to the Third Report, which purports to be "A List of Clergymen of the Established Church who have signed Applications to the Commissioners of Education for Aid that has been granted up to the present Time; noting the Persons who have died, and those who have signified their Desire to withdraw their Signatures, as referred to in Section 3. of this Report." At the End of the Second Section of the Third Report it says, "Of the 116 Clergymen of the Established Church, 95, it will be seen, have Cure of Souls in the respective Places from which the Applications have come;" you understand this List to be the List referred to there?

I do.

Will you refer to the List now produced to you, entitled "Names of Clergymen of the Established Church included in the List No. 5. of the Appendix to the Third Report, who do not come within the Description in that Report, Page 7, as having Cure of Souls in the respective Places from which the Applications have come, or otherwise not to be accounted as Applicants, extending to Thirty-one out of the Ninety-five;" and will you have the goodness to be prepared to verify or contradict that on a future Day?

I will do so.

Have you an Account you were desired to produce, of the Expenses of printing Books, and the Proceeds of the Sale of those Books?

That has not been sent to me. Out of Ten different Points upon which I was directed to obtain Returns I have Returns upon Six; upon the other Four I have not as yet received Returns. These Four are, the Charge and Discharge for the Year ending March 1836, the Account of the Cost of preparing each Book, and the Proceeds by the Sale of each, the Materials on which the Estimate in the Second Report was founded, and the Expenditure of Tyrone House.

What Reason has been given why this Return has not been made, it being an Item in the Discharge of the Year 1835? You will perceive in the Appendix to the Second Report there are given the Charge and Discharge for the Years ending the 31st of March 1833, the 31st of March 1834, and the 31st of March 1835; and it states what has been the Cost incurred by the Board in preparing and printing those Books?

I perceive that.

Do not you see that you were not required to prepare any thing new, but to produce Documents already in existence?

As far as I understood your Lordships Wish upon this Point, there was something new to be prepared. The Print went to a separate Account of the Cost of each Book, and the Proceeds by the Sale of it, and for each separate Year.

How long is it since that was directed; is it not a Month?

I cannot state the precise Day; but in Communications with my Office, which they had on Two Occasions after I sent the Order, it was stated to me that there was a Difficulty in making out a separate Account for each Book and for each Year, which was the Detail in which the Account was required. If the Account had been required in gross, it could have been immediately given, as it is given in the Report of 1835.

Does not the Board keep an Account of the Cost of preparing the Books, and the Proceeds of the Sale of its Books, in such a Way as to show the Cost of each particular Book and the Proceeds of the Sale of each particular Book?

It does, as I imagine. The Vouchers and Particulars of the Accounts for the Three Years previous to March 1835 were forwarded from my Office to the Audit Office in London, where they still lie. As the Commissioners are in the habit of purchasing large Quantities of Linen, Millboards, and Paper at a Time,

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

it would be Matter of much Difficulty separately to show how much was consumed in the preparing of each particular Book.

Will you write to expedite that Return?
Certainly.

You observe in the Third Report, in the Note to Page 8, there is a Statement of the Number of Correspondents of the different Classes?
I do.

Will you run your Eye over that, and see how many Clergymen of the Established Church are stated there to be the Correspondents of the Board?
In Ulster there are stated to be Twenty-three, in Leinster One, in Munster Five, and in Connaught One.

Will you look at the Return bearing Date the 9th of March 1836; do you perceive that there are Thirty Correspondents mentioned in that Note?
Exactly.

Do you know that there are only Twenty-eight given in this Return?
I make them Twenty-eight.

Can you explain what Two were omitted?
There is a Return, by a Comparison of which I could be enabled to answer the Question. I was not aware, until the Question was put, that the Numbers in the Two Papers varied; I had understood that this had been correct when it was given in.

There are Four of the Twenty-eight that have withdrawn since, according to the Return made?
Yes.

As to No. 2., the Reverend W. Ashe, are you aware that he is no longer Curate of Ardagh and Rathronan?
I am.

Then he will be struck out of the List of the efficient Correspondents of the Board?
Not that I am aware of.

Are you aware of the Reason he has been removed from his Curacy?
I am aware of the Reason stated to me by himself.

Have you any Objection to state that Reason?
No. As he stated to me by Letter, the Rector to whom he was Curate having resigned the Parish, a Rector who did his own Duty was appointed in his Stead, and he was removed.

Which Parish does that refer to?
Rathronan, I think. I think he stated to me that Mr. Maule, a Gentleman residing in Donegal, had been his Rector at Rathronan, to whom he had been Curate Twenty Years. This Statement was made in a Letter which I received from Mr. Ashe Four or Five Months since; and that he having resigned, a Rector was appointed, who doing his own Duty, Mr. Ashe was compelled to retire.

That refers to Rathronan?
I think it does.

It does not refer to Ardagh?
I cannot state whether it does; I have not a local Knowledge of the Livings.

It does not refer to Ardagh if that is a separate Benefice?
It is impossible I can answer that Question. I know he was Curate, and dismissed under the Circumstances I have mentioned, according to his Statement in his written Communication to me. I took it generally to be of Rathronan.

Are you aware that the Reverend Mr. Collins is no longer connected with Annagcliff?
I am.

He

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

He also has retired?
He also has retired, handing over as our Correspondent for the Curlurgan School the Clergyman who succeeded him in the Curacy. He has retired only because retiring from Residence in that Place.

Are you aware that in reference to the Reverend William Hewson, stated to be Curate of Magheracloon in the County of Monaghan, that School is stated in the Appendix to the Second Report to have been closed at that Time?
I do see that.

Has that School been revived?
I cannot immediately say; but it will be returned in the Appendix to the Report of last Year, if it have been revived.

By whom was that School applied for; it was a Clergyman of the Established Church, without any other Applicant, lay or clerical?
So it appears.

Will you look to the Return giving the Names of the Clergy in the County of Monaghan, and see what Clergyman is represented as having applied for that School?
It is Mr. Cumming. That Circumstance brings to my Recollection that the School is open and in operation.

Are you aware that Mr. Cumming, who was the sole Applicant for that School, was for many Years non-resident?
No.

Or that his Living was under Sequestration?
No. I am aware that at the Time a Part of the Correspondence between us was carried on his Letters to me were dated from London. I think in his Letters he stated that he was here for the Purpose of the Education of his Family.

Will you produce all the Correspondence from that School for the Purpose of seeing from whence the Letters of the Correspondent came?
Certainly.

You observe the Reverend E. G. Hudson of Ardnagheehy, Correspondent of the School of Glenville in the County of Cork; are you aware that the Reverend Mr. Hudson has no Pastoral Charge anywhere?
I am not aware of that.

Are you aware that he has no Cure of Souls in this Parish of Ardnagheehy?
I am not aware of that.

You will find mentioned as a Correspondent for Blundel's Grange in Armagh the Name of the Reverend C. W. Lyne; are you aware that he is not an Applicant?
I am; we gave his Name in the Return only as a Correspondent. The Honourable Mrs. Caulfield is the Patroness of the Schools, and on going to the Continent she assigned Mr. Lyne as the Correspondent of the Board for the Management and Conduct of the School. I think he is the Curate of the Parish.

There are Two Messrs. M'Causland, the Reverend O. M'Causland and the Reverend R. M'Causland?
There are.

They are represented, the Reverend Oliver M'Causland as Clergyman of the Parish of Ballynarrig, and the Reverend Redmond M'Causland as Clergyman of the Parish of Tamlaght Finlegan?
Yes.

Are you aware that both those are the Benefice of the Reverend Oliver M'Causland?
I am not aware of that.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Are you aware that the Reverend Redmond M'Causland is his Curate?
I cannot say; I am not aware; it is not in my Recollection strongly; my Recollection is that they are Father and Son; one may probably be Rector and the other Curate.

They appear as Two Correspondents for Two Schools in different Benefices?
They are Two Schools in different Parishes.

Not in the same Benefice?
My Information does not enable me to reply to that.

You will see the Name of the Reverend J. Grey Porter as a Correspondent; are you aware that he has no Pastoral Cure whatever in the Parish either of Enniskillen or Fintona?
That I cannot say.

Do you know where the Reverend J. G. Porter lives?
I think at Kilsherry. Enniskillen is the Place from whence his Letters to me, generally speaking, have been dated; sometimes from the Club House in Dublin, the Sackville Street Club.

Are you aware that Kilsherry is a distinct Benefice, at a Distance from this School?
I am not.

The Reverend G. Sampson is put here as Correspondent for Schools in the Parish of Desertohill and Errigle in Londonderry?
He is.

Are you aware that he resides in the County of Kildare?
I know that he got a Preferment lately in that County; but he had a House and was resident in the County of Londonderry, near those Schools.

You do not know that his Residence in the County of Londonderry, when he resided there, was Twelve Miles from these Schools?
No.

Do you know how long he has been settled in Kildare?
Something more than Two Years; I should think between One and Two Years.

He, residing on his Living in the County of Kildare, is the Correspondent of the Board for Two Schools in the County of Londonderry?
I am not aware that he resides upon his Living.

Do you happen to know whether any one of the London Companies has a large Property in the District in which those Schools are?
I do.

Do you know that Mr. Sampson or his Father is the Agent of that Company?
I have understood that the Schools are built upon that Estate, and have been supported, and I believe at this Moment are partly supported by that Company.

Was Mr. Sampson ever Curate in the same Parish in which those Schools are?
I never heard that.

Did you ever hear that he founded those Schools when he was resident there?
I did not. I know during the Time he has been in communication with the Board he has been a most careful and active Correspondent on behalf of those Schools.

Though his general Residence be removed so far as Twelve Miles from those Schools, does not he come occasionally to the immediate Neighbourhood where he had a Residence and House and Thirty Acres of Land, which he occupied?
I do not know that Fact.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Have the goodness to refer to Number 2. of the Returns ordered to be printed on the 9th of March 1837, Page 10. Will you read that Return?

"A Return of the Names of all Clergymen who are Patrons, Managers, or Visitors of Schools under the Board, stating their Religious Denominations and the Names of the Schools, the Counties and Parishes wherein they are situated." The Correspondents of the National Schools are the only Patrons, Managers, and Visitors known to the Commissioners, save that by the Rules of the Commissioners Clergymen of all Denominations are Visitors ex officio.

The Paper now shown to you is a Return made to the House of Commons, ordered to be printed the 21st of July 1835. How do you reconcile the Return you have now read, that the Correspondents of the National Schools are the only Patrons, Managers, and Visitors known to the Commissioners, with that Return you hold in your Hand, where you will see that One Column professes to give a List of the Names of the Patrons, Managers, and Visitors, and that several of those are given to each single School?

I can only reconcile it in this Way: the Return of 1835 gives a fuller List of Names than the mere Correspondents; the Return of March 1837 states the Correspondents are the only Visitors known to the Commissioners; I can only, therefore, reconcile that with the fuller Return in this Way, by stating that they are the more regular Visitors, the more accredited Visitors, the Visitors to whom the Board look, in point of fact, for the Management of the Schools.

You will observe the Return that you were required to make was of all Clergymen who are Patrons, Managers, or Visitors; and that the Return made is, that the Correspondents are the only Patrons, Managers, or Visitors, there being a Return stating that there were others who were Patrons, Managers, or Visitors; do you think that the Order of the House was satisfied by the Return so made?

I think it was satisfied thus: The Commissioners in giving the Correspondents of the National Schools as the only Patrons, Managers, and Visitors known to them, state those whom Experience for the last One or Two Years made them assured were Patrons, Managers, and Visitors.

A Return can be made of all Clergymen who are Patrons, Managers, or Visitors of Schools under the Board on the same Principle that the Return was made in 1835?

I think a Return might be made on the same Principle.

Have you any Doubt that that can be done which was done before?

No. I think a Return can be made of all Clergymen who are Patrons, Managers, or Visitors of Schools under the Board.

Have you any Doubt of that?

I do not think I ought to have any Doubt.

Will you turn to your own Evidence, Page 105, in reference to the School at Tullylamney. You say, "the Application being granted a School was founded, and continued on the Board's Books till November, when a chance Circumstance led to this Discovery, that the Person who was the Owner of the Ground, and who was set forth in all the Documents as a Manager, had never applied, and had not known that the School was on the Board." How do you reconcile this Return, that the Correspondents of the National Schools are the only Patrons, Managers, and Visitors known to the Commissioners, with the Answer just read by yourself from your Evidence on that Day?

I do not see any Difference or any thing to reconcile. The Return is of the Correspondents and Managers and Visitors, the Answer to which my Attention is directed; in respect to the Tullylamney School is a Case where there was the Name of a Person returned as Patron, Manager, and Visitor, with whom a Correspondence was carried on during the Time mentioned by me in this Answer. Chance led to the Discovery that there had been one continued Forgery of that Name from Beginning to End.

You will remark that this Paper says, that the Correspondents are the only Patrons, Managers, and Visitors; the Part of the Evidence given by yourself

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

speaks of a Manager as if it was only One of several of that School. How do you reconcile that?

I reconcile it in this Way: before Payment of Salaries each Half Year we require certain Queries to be answered on the Part of the School, and testified by One or Two Managers, if there be Two. The Queries in respect of this School were certified by this Person, called a Manager, and One or Two other Names.

You can make out a Return, according to what is expressed in the Order, of all Patrons, Managers, or Visitors?

Yes; I think on the Principle in the Return to which my Attention is called it can be done, making Allowances for Changes of Circumstances.

Will you turn to No. 3. of that Return in the next Page, and read what the Heading of that Return is?

"Return of the Names of all Trustees of Schoolhouses which are held in Trust under the Regulations of the Board; specifying their Description and Religious Denomination, so far as the same may be known."

Read the Statement?

"The Religious Denomination of the Trustees cannot be specified more particularly than is herein-after given, there not being any Rule of the Commissioners to institute Inquiry upon this Head."

Are the Trustees often also the Applicants for the School?

Sometimes.

Are they often?

I cannot say often.

Do not you think they are more commonly the Applicants than not?

I cannot say so.

In all Cases where the Trustees are also Applicants for the Schools their Religious Denomination can be obtained?

Certainly.

Can you undertake that a Return is made according to that?

I can make a Return of the Trustees who are also Applicants, knowing their Religious Denomination.

In what Cases are Trusts required?

In every Case where the Board grants Aid to build a Schoolhouse, or where it grants any large Sum of Money in enlarging or repairing it.

When Sums are granted for fitting up are Trusts there required?

If the Sum be a large Sum of Money.

Always?

Not always.

Not always even where the Sum is large?

In Cases where Trusts have been dispensed with a Bond has been taken.

In all Cases where the Trust has been dispensed with a Bond has been taken?

I have not in my Recollection a Case where a Bond has not been taken where large Sums have been given for fitting up, or else an Undertaking by Letter to adhere to the Rules of the Board.

You first say where the Sum is a large Sum a Trust is required, then that where a Trust is not required a Bond is required. Now you say there are Cases where neither Trust nor Bond is required, but a Letter promising to adhere to the Rules of the Board is required, and that is sufficient?

What I stated was, that in all Cases of building a Deed with Trusts is required; in Cases where a Sum of Money has been given for enlarging or largely repairing a Schoolhouse a Deed with Trusts has also been required; in some Cases where the Grants for Fittings-up have been of a large Sum a Bond has been required, or else an Undertaking to abide by the Rules of the Board.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Do you not perceive that your last Answer is materially different from the former?
I do not see any Difference.

What Sum do you consider a large Sum for fitting up?
I think generally the Rule has been where it was over 20*l.*

You mean then that it is considered a large Sum where it is above 20*l.*?
Yes. I hope we mean the same Thing by Fittings-up; I do not call Furniture Fittings-up; the Board never have conceived that giving Furniture to the Amount of 30*l.* or 40*l.* they would be justified in calling for this Security, Furniture being of a perishable Nature.

Are you to be understood that in no Case, however large the Sum, the Board has required any Security whatever?
No; it is not in my Recollection, where a Grant has been made for merely furnishing a School, that they have required a Security.

To whatever Extent?
I think, as I recollect, not to any Extent in Cases where it is merely for Furniture for the Schoolrooms.

Have the goodness to refer to Page 3 of my Lord Stanley's Letter; you will see that the Board is told for what Purposes they should apply Money voted by Parliament?
I see it is stated.

Do you see any Authority in this Letter, either elsewhere or in that Passage to which your Attention is called, given to the Board to give Money for the Supply of Furniture to the Schools?
I certainly do see Authority for giving Furniture.

Have the goodness to read the Part to which you refer?
In Page 2 the Commissioners are told to "refuse all Applications," where there is not local Aid, "in which the following Objects are not locally provided for; first, a Fund sufficient for the annual Repairs of the Schoolhouse and Furniture." There is a negative Authority, the Commissioners being directed not to do it unless there be local Aid.

Do not you perceive that instead of being an Authority for that it is a direct Prohibition, unless certain Things are locally provided for, of which the very first is "a Fund sufficient for the annual Repairs of the Schoolhouse and Furniture"?
The Commissioners have not so looked upon it.

The Question is, whether you can see any Authority in this Letter of Lord Stanley's for granting Money for a Supply of Furniture to Schools. You say that can be done; do you consider that Letter as an Authority?
I never looked upon it as negativing the Authority, unless in Cases where local Aid was not raised in contribution towards the same Object. Local Contribution appeared to be the Spirit of all those; local Contribution towards Salary, towards building the Schoolhouse, and, by fair reasoning, furnishing the Schoolhouse when built; and on that Construction, according to my Understanding, have the Board acted, and on that Construction I should act at this Moment, conceiving that when the Board gave Assistance to build a Schoolhouse they would also be justified in assisting to furnish it, if there were a local Contribution.

Supposing you authorized, in a Case where the Board grant Money for building, to grant Money for furnishing also; is there any Authority for granting Money for furnishing where they do not grant Money for building?
I give the same Answer to that Question as I did to the former one. I should understand that the Board might contribute to the Maintenance of the School by Furniture, if the Schoolhouse had been already built, equally as if they had themselves contributed towards the building of it. I have ever looked upon these Grants as depending on the Fact of the Existence of a local Contribution for effecting such Objects.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Do you consider that Passage as an Authority to the Commissioners to grant Money for supplying a School with Furniture to which they had not contributed to the building?

According to my Understanding I would conceive it so.

Will you look again to Page 3, and see whether Lord Stanley has or has not limited the Application of the Funds voted by Parliament to certain Purposes?

I presume the Question points my Attention to the Six Divisions of Distribution of the local Fund.

Have the goodness to read them?

"The Board will be intrusted with the absolute Control over the Funds which may be annually voted by Parliament, which they shall apply to the following Purposes: first, granting Aid for the Erection of Schools, subject to the Conditions herein-before specified; secondly, paying Inspectors for visiting and reporting upon Schools; thirdly, Gratuities to Teachers of Schools conducted under the Rules laid down, not exceeding Pounds each; fourthly, establishing and maintaining a Model School in Dublin, and training Teachers for Country Schools; fifthly, editing and printing such Books of Moral and Literary Education as may be approved of for the Use of the Schools, and supplying them and School Necessaries at not lower than Half Price; sixthly, defraying all necessary contingent Expenses of the Board."

Among those Purposes can you discern any Authority for granting Money for furnishing Schools as to which the Board does not contribute to the building?

I would continue the same Course of reasoning as that upon which I gave my former Answer upon this Point; I would refer No. 1. of the Sixfold Division back again to the previous Instructions which are set out in Page 2, to which I have just referred.

You will see that those are the Conditions on which the Board is to assist in building?

I do.

You will see that those are the Conditions referring to the Erection of Schools?

I do. I give my Answer with much Hesitation, because I perceive I am required to put my own Construction upon this Paragraph in opposition to the View presented in the Question; but I think and have thought that the Commissioners were acting right upon this Point, reasoning as I have ventured to express myself, referring this Part of Page 3 to Page 2, and remembering that the Principle of the Letter authorizes the Assistance of Government where there exists a local Contribution.

Do you understand by the Erection of a School the building of the Walls and putting on the Roof of the Schoolhouse?

Yes.

Nothing more?

That is what we call the Erection of a Schoolhouse.

The Question refers to the Erection of a School; do you understand by that the mere building of the Walls and putting on the Roof?

No; I would call the Erection of a School every thing appertaining to a School.

Do you include the Furniture necessary; that is, the Desks and Wooden Work under the Roof, as a necessary Part of the Erection of a School?

I certainly consider it a necessary Part of the Erection of a School.

Do you think the Desks and the Forms constitute a Part of the Furniture of the School?

Certainly.

Do you think they are included in the Phrase the Erection of Schools?

According to my Construction and Mode of reasoning it would include them.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

them. I have found the Board of Commissioners act upon that; and looking for the Reason of their so acting, I always conscientiously was persuaded they were acting up to the Spirit of those Rules, and upon their fair Construction.

Do you consider that the Power the Commissioners possess for erecting Schools implies a Power to furnish those Schools with such Articles of Furniture as are indispensable for carrying on the School?
I do.

You will bear in mind that the Question refers to the Cases where the Board does not give Aid for the Erection of Schools, but grants large Sums for the fitting up of Schools; do you see any Authority in Lord Stanley's Letter for that; you say you think, by a certain Process of reasoning you have described, you do see that?
I do.

Have the goodness to take into your Hand the Second Report with the Appendix, and refer to Page 27; in the County of Derry you will see the School of Cahireween; do you see any thing there given by the Board for the Erection of a School?
I see the Sum of 147*l.* for fitting up.

Do you see under the Head of Building any Sum whatever given for that School?
I do not.

Do you see any Grant for fitting up that School?
I do see the Sum of 147*l.*

Without any thing having been given for the building of that School?
In that Case the Board granted a Sum to enlarge the House. There was for some Time a Doubt under what Head to enter such a Grant in our Books, whether it was to be entered under the Head of Building or of Fitting up; and with our Book-keepers, as the Practice varied, it has been accordingly done in both Ways; but in general we have not put it down under the Head of Building, unless it was for the complete Erection of a House. In the Case referred to this Grant has been entered under the Head of "Fitting up." We have a Trust Deed in this Case, the Grant being for the Enlargement of a House already existing.

There is a Trust Deed there?
Yes, there is a Trust Deed there.

Will you look to the Column, "Amount of local Contributions towards building, fitting up, and Requisites," and look to the Amount against that School?
Opposite to that Sum of 147*l.* I observe the Sum of 14*l.* 9*s.* 4*d.* as a local Contribution; that was in Money; we could put down in the Return referred to no other Contribution but Money; but there exist in fact other Species of local Contribution, which, although not Money, is regarded as Money's Worth, such as Materials, Work, and Labour, &c. In this particular Case the House which originally stood upon the Ground, and towards which the Board have given this Sum of 147*l.* for its Enlargement, was looked upon as the local Contribution of the Place.

How long had that House been built?
I cannot say; but there being a House already built, though not of sufficient Extent, such House was looked upon as local Contribution, and as such sufficient to warrant the Board in granting the Sum of 147*l.* in order to make it larger and more complete.

What Value was placed upon that Building at the Time?
I will answer by stating in what Manner the Valuation is made in such Cases. We take the Plan of the House as it originally stood, with the Plan of the House as it is designed to be when altered and enlarged; and having ascertained the Value of the House upon this enlarged Plan by allowing (according to our Rule) by the Cubic Foot for it, and being also satisfied as to the Quality of the Materials in the House as it originally stood, the Grant is made of Two Thirds of the full Amount thus found.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

You have Reason to believe that the Valuation placed upon the School-house in fact existing was equal to One Half of the Sum you have advanced?
I do believe such was the Case.

Do you see in the Letter of Lord Stanley any Authority for such an Application of Money?
My Answer to that must be precisely of the same Complexion with my Answer when my Attention was turned to Lord Stanley's Letter before. The Board conceived every thing that equitably and by fair reasoning could be deduced from it as authorizing them in substantially affording Assistance towards bonâ fide Applications for the Erection or maintaining of National Schools.

The next Article is the School of Dingle, where the Sum of 45*l.* was given; to that must be added, as in the other Case, the Sum for School Requisites; the last Column gives the local Contributions towards building and fitting up, and Requisites?
There is the Half Price of the Requisites in the last Column.

The Grant being 45*l.*, what do you perceive to have been the Amount of the local Contribution there?
I see the Sum of 11*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.*

Is that a Third Part?
It is not.

Then how came that?
I cannot at present say; but that 45*l.* may have been granted for Furniture, and I have stated that giving Money for Furniture was an Exception.

To any Extent?
No.

To what Extent?
I cannot at present give an Explanation of that Sum of 45*l.*; it looks much larger than the Proportion of the local Subscription would warrant.

Are the Trust Deeds always the same; is it one uniform Form on which they are made?
It is.

What are the Conditions of the Trust?
They are exactly an Echo of the Conditions set out in the Rules and Regulations. The Description of the Deed is briefly this; it is an Indenture between the Person who grants the Site for the School, the Trustees who take it, and the Commissioners of Education; and after reciting that a School House was built, and so much Money locally contributed towards it, and so much granted by the Commissioners, it proceeds in the usual legal Form to vest it, and then states the Conditions on which the Grant is made are "herein-after mentioned;" that is to say, that Religious Education shall be given as our Rules require, and that a combined Moral and Literary Education shall be given as the Rules require, and that the Teachers shall be fineable and dismissible and removeable according to the Discretion of the Commissioners.

What Course is pursued with regard to those Schools which have received Grants from Government for which Land has been already made over under certain Trusts?
In respect of such as have applied to us, the Trustees under the former Trust Deed declare the Trust afresh according to our Conditions.

Do you invariably require a new Trust under such Circumstances?
We do; we have had many such Cases.

Is there any Provision to enable the Board to alter their Rules without abandoning the Security afforded by the Trust?
No; the Trust Deed has ever been, and I should hope will continue to be, constructed in a Manner that both Parties may be equally protected against any Breach of good Faith in the other. There is no Provision made for Change of Opinion on either Side.

If

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

If the Board were to think it necessary for any Reason to make an Alteration in their Rules, any Trusts that have been hitherto created would become absolutely void?

It would be Matter of Opinion as to what the Effect of these Alterations would be, and that might be a Question for a Court of Equity.

You are a Barrister?

I am. My Opinion is this, that if any Alteration be made by the Board which goes to the Essence of the System, that then, all those Trusts being violated by them, they could no longer avail themselves of the Covenants of the Deed, so as to compel the Trustees to adopt such Alteration; the Schoolhouses therefore must go from them.

Speaking in the double Character of a Barrister and a Witness, you say that if the Alteration went to the Principles of the System the Schoolhouses must go; do you think nothing short of breaking in on the Principles of the System would excuse the Trustees from obeying the new Orders of the Board?

I think there is full Security for the Maintenance of the Principles of the System in the Trust Deed; that it is for that Purpose the Trust Deed is required on the one Side and executed on the other.

Supposing the Board to make any considerable Alteration in its Rules, do you conceive that the Trustees bind themselves by their Trust Deed to obey those Rules so altered?

To that I can only answer, that when such Circumstances arise I shall consider what those Alterations are or in effect would be; but the Question is too general for me to trust myself upon at present.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Witness is again called in.

You have said, in your former Evidence, that in Cases of Schools built on Chapel Lands Difficulties sometimes arise about the Ownership of the Fee, and that sometimes the Owners are considered to be the Priests; can any real Security be given in such Cases?

The only real Security we have been able to get in such Cases is a Lease or a Trust Deed, executed by the Roman Catholic Clergyman claiming under such a Title of Possession, to the Trustees, in the usual Form. Those are Cases where there has been an undisputed Possession in such Clergyman or his Predecessors, or in the Parish, for perhaps much more than a Hundred Years.

How can the Priests give Security on the Property; is there the slightest Pretence for the Priests having any legal Right to the Property?

They have no other legal Right of Property than that arising from long and undisputed Possession.

You mean that the Priests in succession have possessed it?

Yes.

Is that what you would, as a Lawyer, describe as a long and undisputed Possession?

I am speaking of the Fact rather than the Right; that they have had long and undisputed Possession, being the Priests of the Chapel, the Chapel having been there for a considerable Time.

You mean that successive Priests for a long Term of Years have dealt with this Ground as if it were theirs?

I do.

Do you think there is the slightest Shadow of legal Right which the Priests of the Day derive from the Use of this by the Priests of a former Generation?

That is decidedly a Question of Law. The Answer I would give upon the Part of the Commissioners is, that, under the Necessity of the Case, they have been satisfied with the Fact of such Possession.

In point of Law you admit there is no Security?

I see no other Security than the long and undisputed Possession with

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

regard to the Ground on which the House stands, and the long Succession of a Number of Persons setting themselves up during their Continuance there as Parish Priests as Owners of the Soil, and undisturbed in their Possession of it. This Question, however, applies only to such Cases where the Roman Catholic Clergyman is the Owner of the Soil under colour of such Title; there are other Cases where he is the Owner of the Soil by direct Lease.

With regard to those Grants of Land by the Priest, you say that they occasionally are Leaseholders of the Land?

Yes.

Would you consider that, or would the Board consider that, as a sufficient Property in the Land to make it over for the Purpose to the Board?

Yes; where their Leases are for long Terms of Years.

What has been the shortest Length of Lease you would consider sufficient to justify the making of a Grant by the Board.

If it were Money granted for building a Schoolhouse, the Board would not be content with so short a Term as Thirty Years; they would look for a Term of Fifty or Sixty Years, or longer.

What is the general Term of those Leases?

They have varied extremely; the Board appear to have acted upon the Principle, that where a large Grant was made for building, there a Lease for a long Term should be required, and where a small Grant was made, for instance, such a Sum as 40*l.* or 50*l.*, there they are satisfied with a shorter Term; but in every Case they require the longest Term they can get.

Are you satisfied with a Term from the Lessee without having ascertained whether the Possessor in Fee of the Land is willing to make the Grant?

Yes; provided the Lessee has been and is in Possession under the Lease.

Do you not contemplate that at the Expiration of that Lease that Building may become the Property of a Landlord who may not choose to continue the School in connexion with the Board?

That Risk must necessarily be run; on the other hand is the outstanding Term vested in the Trustees, and the perishable Nature of a Building which must in Time fall into Decay.

What is the Average Length of those Terms?

I think generally about Sixty Years.

Do you recollect what is the shortest Lease on which you have made any Grant?

The shortest Term on which we have made any Grant was a Term for a Life.

Do you recollect the Age of the Life?

The Life was, to the best of my Recollection, a Life at middle Age; but the Sum of Money granted by the Board was small.

Do you recollect the Name?

I have not it upon my Mind at this Moment. I also remember another Case, in which the Term of Years was small, and the Board in that Case, instead of granting Two Thirds, granted only One Third of the Amount necessary for building.

Do you recollect the Name of that last Case?

I can furnish the Names at another Day; there are Two Cases of that Kind.

Do you recollect the Amount in the last Case, which you say was only the smaller Proportion?

It was something about the Third of 180*l.*

Do you recollect the Number of Years?

I do not, but I will inform your Lordships correctly. There were Two Cases.

Do you recollect whether the Board, before making the Grant, took any pains to ascertain whether the Landlord who would probably succeed to the Possession of the Land was friendly or unfriendly towards the Board?

Not where there was any thing of an outstanding Term of the Average Length, which I have stated in my former Answers.

Have

261

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Have they never made a Grant where there was no outstanding Term?
Not to my Knowledge.

Must not the Board have been aware that at the Expiration of that short Time the Fund expended was lost to the Country?
They must of course.

Upon the Subject of the Trusts, are the Descriptions which are given in the Return, No. 3, Page 11, Province of Ulster, taken from the Trust Deeds?
They are taken from the Trust Deeds or from the Paper of Instructions which is sent from my Office before preparing the Trust Deed, in order to get the Descriptions set out.

The Trust Deeds would of course be prepared accordingly?
They always have been and are.

The Persons named are the Parties to those Deeds?
They are.

Will you look at Page 17, Robinstown School, in the County of Kilkenny; who are the Trustees there?
"The Right Reverend William Kinsella and the Honourable John William Ponsonby."

What is the Description of the Right Reverend William Kinsella?
"D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory of the City of Kilkenny." The Description of the Honourable John William Ponsonby is "commonly called Lord Viscount Duncannon."

Have the goodness to read the 24th Clause of the 10th of George IV., commonly called the Roman Catholic Relief Act?
"And whereas the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the Doctrine, Discipline, and Government thereof, and likewise the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the Doctrine, Discipline, and Government thereof, are by the respective Acts of Union of England and Scotland, and of Great Britain and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably: And whereas the Right and Title of Archbishops to their respective Provinces, of Bishops to their Sees, and of Deans to their Deaneries, as well in England as in Ireland, have been settled and established by Law; be it therefore enacted, That if any Person after the Commencement of this Act, other than the Person thereunto authorized by Law, shall assume or use the Name, Style, or Title of Archbishop of any Province, Bishop of any Bishoprick, or Dean of any Deanery, in England or Ireland, he shall for every such Offence forfeit and pay the Sum of One hundred Pounds."

Does he appear upon that List as Bishop of Ossory?
He appears in this printed List from which I read "D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory of the City of Kilkenny."

Is that the Mode in which he gave in his own Designation?
I should suppose that this has been copied from the Mode in which the Paper gave his Designation; whether he himself wrote it I cannot say.

Was that Return made by Order of the Board?
Yes.

Has the Board recognized him?
I cannot say that the Board has recognized him in this Capacity; this Description was from the Mode in which it was returned on the Paper sent for the Purpose.

You have said that he has in the Deed described himself in this Manner?
The Deed is not prepared by him or his Agent.

Do the Trustees whose Names appear upon the List you have referred to call themselves by those Descriptions?
I cannot say that they call themselves by those Descriptions; my Impression is that the Roman Catholic Clergy do not call themselves Bishops.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Do you conceive that they are designated in that List as they appear described in the Deed?

My Impression is that they are so designated in the Deed. If the Question is whether the Board recognized them as Bishops, the Board certainly never did.

Do they call themselves by those Descriptions?

If I understand the Question to refer to the Trustees generally, I cannot say; I do not meet the Trustees; all I know of them is by the Descriptions given in the Paper returned to us, in which those Points are answered; but in whose Handwriting those Descriptions are I cannot say, nor whether they call themselves so.

Can you produce the Trust Deeds of several Schools if the Names are given to you?

Certainly; they shall be sent for.

Are Testimonials of Moral Character of Persons proposed to the Board as Teachers of Schools under this Arrangement required before the Appointment is sanctioned?

The Query in the Query Sheet, whether Testimonials of Moral Character can or cannot be produced, is always required to be answered, and answered in the Affirmative; but it has never been the Practice to require the Testimonials to be sent up to the Board. I speak of Applications for Schools in order for Salaries to Teachers.

The Question is, whether the Board does require the Testimonials of Moral Character of the Persons proposed to the Board as Teachers under them to be sent to them?

They never require those Testimonials to be forwarded to the Board; they are satisfied with the Answer given in the Query Sheet.

They do not require them to be sent up to them?

No; I do not know that at all to be the Practice.

Have the goodness to refer to Lord Stanley's Letter; you will find this Passage in Page 3: the Board is to "allow to the Individuals or Bodies applying for Aid the Appointment of their own Teacher, subject to the following Restrictions and Regulations;" the Third of which is, "He shall have received Testimonials of good Conduct and of general Fitness for the Situation from the Board"?

I see that.

Do you know whether that is attended to or not?

It is not attended to, and for this Reason, that it applies to Teachers to be trained in the Model School in Dublin. That Training School is not yet in existence. When that Training School comes into existence, and Teachers are there trained, those Testimonials pointed out by Lord Stanley's Letter will then be given, as the Board, I apprehend, will then see that this Duty shall be performed; but until that Period arrives it cannot.

Have the goodness to look to the Paragraph just above: "It is not intended that this Regulation should apply to prevent the Admission of Masters or Mistresses of Schools already established who may be approved of by the Commissioners." Does that or does it not, in your Judgment, appear to imply that the Commissioners shall have the Means of approving or disapproving of the Masters?

That Paragraph to which I am referred I apprehend is not complete in this Copy; and if your Lordships had before you the complete Sentence as it is in the original Letter, I think the Question would answer itself. I have in my Box in the adjoining Room the Letter containing that Paragraph in full.

The Question respects the Approbation of the Teachers by the Commissioners; do the Commissioners take any other Steps than those you have mentioned to ascertain whether the Masters or Mistresses recommended to them are worthy of their Approbation or not?

No, none other than I have stated; they are satisfied with putting "Query," which institutes an Inquiry upon the Point.

Are

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Are the Masters and Mistresses just alluded to considered as permanent in those Schools, or only placed there until they have had an Opportunity of being further instructed in the Model Schools?

The Board only consider them as temporary; they consider they have a Right to remove them for Incompetence, or to bring them up to their own Model School to improve them if they believe them improvable.

Do you consider it is the Intention of the Board, when the Model School is established, to have them up?

It is; they have already had in their Training School, although very imperfect, above 240 of those Teachers.

Do you conceive their Attention will be called to the Testimonials of the Teachers when they have a Model School?

The Testimonials I conceive to be given are to be given by the Board to the Managers of Schools after the Course of training is completed, as it is to those Testimonials, in my Opinion, the Question refers.

Have you read the Examination of Mr. Carlile before the Committee of the House of Commons in the Year 1834 respecting Irish Education?

I have read it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned 'till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 7° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Reverend FRANCIS BLAKE WOODWARD is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Clergyman resident in Dublin?
I am.

You are Curate of the District of St. Stephen's, which is a Portion of the Parish of St. Peter's?
Yes.

That being Part of the Benefice of the Archdeacon of Dublin?
Yes.

St. Stephen's is the District in which the Model School of the National Board was situate before its Removal to Marlborough Street?
Yes.

Were you ever applied to, as the Clergyman of that Parish, to assist in giving Religious Instruction to the Children of the Established Church who went to that School?
Yes; the Archdeacon of Dublin, who is the Rector of the Parish, told me that the Archbishop of Dublin had applied to him, as Clergyman of the Parish, to know whether he would make Provision for that Duty, and he then applied to me, as being Curate of the District in which the School was placed, to know if I had any Objection, he himself had none, to One of the Curates undertaking the Duty; I said, not.

What is the Archdeacon's Name?
Torrens.

Had you been a declared Opponent of the System of the Board?
Yes, I had.

You had made no Secret of your Opposition to the System, but you thought it right, as a Clergyman of the Parish, to give the Instruction to those Children who attended this School within your Parish?
Yes.

How long did you continue to give that Instruction?
I cannot be very accurate, but for about, I should say, Fourteen Months.

When did you begin?
I think it was about the Beginning of September 1833; I do not pretend now to speak very accurately.

Was that as early as the Model School was established?
It was soon after; but my Impression is, that there was some little Delay; that Matters were rather unsettled there for some Time before I began.

You say you are One of the Curates of the District of St. Stephen's; are there more than One?
One more.

Did he take any Part in the Instruction?
Yes; we attended on alternate Saturdays.

Who is the other Curate?
Mr. Maturin.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

What Length of Time were you enabled to give?
Never more than an Hour, and I think never less than Three Quarters; it varied from Three Quarters of an Hour to an Hour.

Were many of the young People who attended that School Children of the Established Church belonging to the District of St. Stephen's?
Very few.

Then did you feel, or was it suggested to you by any one, that as the Children of your Parish did not attend that School there was no special Call upon you, except that the School was established in your District?
I should not say that the Children of my District not attending would have made much Difference if I had had Time; if I had had Time I should have felt equally bound to attend whether the Children of my own District were there or not.

Is the District a very populous District?
Very populous.

How many Members of the Church of England and Ireland inhabit it?
I should say about 3,500.

And you and Mr. Maturin have the sole Charge of those 3,500 Church Members in a populous Part of Dublin?
Yes.

How many Roman Catholics are there in that District, do you know?
I do not; I have no Means of knowing.

Does it materially preponderate?
It is a Part of the Town in which there are a great Number of the upper Classes, who are principally Protestants.

But while there are a great Number of the upper Classes there are also a great many of the lower?
There are.

Therefore One Hour a Week was as much Time as you could possibly give in Justice to the more special Duties of your Charge?
Yes.

What Course did you adopt in instructing the Children of the Established Church?
I found it a very difficult Duty to discharge, the Children being of such different Ages, and having that limited Time to give. I used to instruct them in the Church Catechism, in a Chapter of the Scriptures, and in the Sunday Collect.

How many Protestant Children were there in the School at that Time?
I should say that the Attendance averaged, as well as I can remember, perhaps Nineteen.

Between what Ages were they; what do you suppose was the Age of the youngest and of the oldest; were there any as young as Seven?
Fully as young as Seven.

As young as Six?
Yes; I should say there were.

Younger than Six?
I should think there were One or Two fully as young as Five.

How old was the oldest?
Perhaps Fifteen.

And there were Nineteen Children?
Yes, on an Average; sometimes more and sometimes less than that Number.

Do you happen to know how many Children were on the Books at the Time?
No, I do not; I was never in the Model School but once, and that only in

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

in the Boys School. I have an Impression on my Mind, that at that Time I asked, and they told me that there were about 200 Boys.

How many Girls?
I did not inquire; at least if I did I forget. I was not in the Girls School.

When you say 200, do you mean that that Number were in attendance, or were on the Books; have you any Reason to know which it was?
No, I cannot say; but I remember asking the Question, how many Boys were in the School, and One of the Masters said 200, but whether on the Books or in attendance I cannot say.

In the Second Report for the Year ending March 1833 it is stated that in the Model School there were 394 Boys and 235 Girls; that was preceding the Time that your Attendance was given at this School; at what Time did you cease?
Either November 1834 or the beginning of December.

Had you any Means of ascertaining the Number of the Children not of the Church of England that attended the School?
No, I had not.

Those Nineteen Children were of different Ages, from Five to Fifteen, and that, you say, caused a great Difficulty in your giving efficient Instruction during the Hour which you were able to give them in the Week?
Very great, in fact so great that I felt in the whole Time of my Attendance there that my Attendance could be of very little Use.

Did you find that the Children were very ready to learn?
No; very much the opposite, with the Exception of One or Two.

Why was that?
I attributed it to their not being under the Control of the Clergyman, or in fact of anybody that could look after their Religious Instruction.

Their Attendance was merely voluntary?
It was.

Was the Attendance regularly given; did the same Children come constantly?
A few were very constant.

Were the Majority?
I should not say that the Majority were constant; I should say that the Attendance was tolerably regular, but that a large Proportion of them were extremely irregular.

Were all those unwilling to learn?
No; a few, One or Two, were willing.

How many?
Really my Impression is not above Three or Four; but it is now nearly Two Years and a Half since I attended.

Have you, as the Curate of the District of St. Stephen's, any School under your Inspection and Care for Children of your own Persuasion?
Yes.

Do you find those Children equally unwilling to learn, and that it is equally difficult to teach them?
No, very far from it.

Why is that; what causes that Difference, do you suppose?
I should attribute it to different Causes. In the first place, that being the Children of my own Parish, and being under me, that they respect both me and my Colleague more than Children collected in the promiscuous Way that they were in the Model School, having no Knowledge of us; and also I attribute it to the Fact of the Schoolmaster being a Functionary under us in carrying on their Religious Education.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Did you find any Assistance whatever from the Master, either Dr. M'Arthur or either of the Under Teachers, in urging those Children to receive your Instruction?

None; at the same Time I should say that I never asked for it.

Did many of them learn much by heart?

I did not require any thing to be learned by heart except the Collects and the Church Catechism by those that did not know it.

Did you find that in fact many of them did learn those Things by heart?

No, I did not.

You say that you attended the Schools only Fourteen or Fifteen Months; the Model School continued to be in St. Stephen's Parish for a considerable Time longer, did it not?

Yes; I should say a Year and a Half longer than I continued to attend.

What was the Reason of your ceasing to give your Attendance there?

I did so in consequence of the Archbishop of Dublin recommending me to resign the Situation of Religious Instructor there.

Did he tell you why he gave that Recommendation to you?

Yes, he did.

What was the Reason that he gave?

It was in consequence of Complaints having been made to him.

To him or to the Board?

To him, as I understood, that I had endeavoured to influence the Parents of the Children not to send their Children to the Model School.

Did his Grace state that that was the Reason why he thought that you ought to resign the Office of giving Instruction to the Children?

His Grace told me that if those Complaints were to come in a formal Manner before the Board they would be under the Necessity of excluding me; and he told me very kindly,—he was extremely kind to me upon the Occasion,—that he would very much regret that such a Step should be taken; it would be a great Annoyance to me, and he recommended me to prevent that by sending in my Resignation to him.

Did you understand his Grace to say that if the Clergyman of the Parish was opposed to the System of the Board, and dissuaded the Parents of the Children in his Parish from attending, that it was contrary to the Rules of the Board for a Clergyman under such Circumstances to give Religious Instruction to those Children of his own Persuasion that did attend the Schools?

I did not understand the Archbishop as saying any thing of that Sort; but it appeared to me to be implied in the Proceeding that he adopted upon the Occasion.

You did not understand that there was any special Reason for your being advised to retire from the Office of instructing the Children which was not connected with a general Rule that would apply to all Clergymen under similar Circumstances?

No, I did not so understand; but nothing was said of the Sort.

Was there any other Reason, whether well-founded or ill-founded, stated to you as a Matter of Complaint?

Yes; it was said that I had in the School,—that is, in the Room that I had the Use of for the Purpose of instructing the Children there,—advised the Children not to come to the School.

Was that true?

No, it was not.

Who told you that such a Complaint had been made?

I learnt it at the Archbishop's. When the Archbishop sent for me to answer those Charges they were in a Paper, and his Chaplain, Dr. Dickenson, read them.

In the Archbishop's Presence?

Yes.

269

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

And that was One of the Charges?
Yes.

Did you deny it at the Time?
Yes.

Upon that was the Archbishop satisfied?
He was satisfied with respect to that.

Did he say that he was satisfied upon that Point?
He did.

Have you been prominent as an Opponent of the System of the Board?
In a certain Sense I should say that I have been; so far as preaching, I was. Soon after the Project was announced that such a Thing was intended to be established I preached against it.

In the Pulpit of St. Stephen's Church?
Yes.

Do you recollect to what Extent you preached against it?
It is now upwards of Five Years ago, so that I cannot be very accurate.

Have you the Sermon by you?
I have not.

Have you it at Dublin?
Yes.

Should you have any Objection to send for it if wished for?
Not the slightest.

In the meanwhile can you give their Lordships the Purport of it, or can you state any thing that you said that was especially strong; the Nature of the Objections that you urged, or any thing that you please that you consider of Importance?
My main Objections, as I stated in that Sermon, were, in the first place, that I thought that the Plan was a direct Check to the Growth of Protestantism in Ireland; and, secondly, that I conceived that it was both a direct Encouragement and a legal Establishment of both Popery and Unitarianism; and, thirdly, I conceived that it was calculated to spread Infidelity from one End of the Country to the other.

Were you assailed for having preached that Sermon in any way?
I was.

So that it was very notorious that you had preached the Sermon?
It was very notorious. My Congregation is a large one, and so far as some of the Papers, called the Radical Papers, in Dublin, could make it notorious, the Notice they took of it made it so.

They took vehement Notice of it?
Yes; One or Two.

Did you receive any Intimation from the Archbishop of Dublin on the Subject?
Yes.

What was that?
It was through my Rector, the Archdeacon of Dublin; he told me that the Archbishop had complained to him of the Sermon which he had heard that I had preached, and desired him to speak to me upon the Subject.

What did your Rector say to you; will you state the Extent to which you were informed Displeasure had been excited?
I do not remember further than I have stated, that my Rector told me that the Archbishop had heard of this Sermon, and had complained to him, and desired him to speak to me upon the Subject.

When was this Sermon preached; soon after the Establishment of the Board?
It was in February 1832.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

And it was after this that the Archbishop desired the Rector to request you and the other Curate to give Instruction to the Children in the School?

I do not know that the Archbishop actually desired the Archdeacon to employ us; he called upon him as Rector of the Parish to make Provision for it.

Did the Archbishop, in the Communication you had with him when those Complaints were made, recur to this Matter of the Sermon at all?

No.

Did he show a general Kindness and Goodwill to you upon that Occasion?

Yes.

You parted good Friends?

Exactly.

Has there been any Complaint against you for your Mode of treating the training Teachers in the School?

I believe there was, though I never heard the Fact that such a Complaint had been made; but the Schoolmaster, Dr. M'Arthur, told me that he would report a Proceeding of mine to the Board. I never heard that he did.

What was the Proceeding that he said he should report?

It was the First Day that the Masters in training attended; and when I went into the private Room set apart for the Clergyman in attendance, I found Three or Four Men that I did not know sitting with the Children; no Communication was ever made to me upon the Subject of those Men that were training, and no Permission asked of me to allow them to be in the Room. In short I did not know who they were; and when I went in they remained sitting. They did not seem to take any Notice of me; did not stand up or take any Notice that the Room was mine. I begged to know who they were, and they told me who they were, and that they had come to listen to my catechising of the Children.

Who did they say that they were?

That they were training as Masters in the Model School.

Did they tell you whether they were Protestants or Catholics?

That I forget, but from the Circumstances I take it for granted that they were Protestants.

What did you say?

I requested them to leave the Room. I told them that the Room was for my Use to instruct the Children in, and that I did not know what Right they had to take Possession of it, and in short that I did not wish them to be there.

You considered them as Intruders?

Yes.

It had not been told to you that such Persons were to be Part of your Scholars?

No.

After this did any thing pass between Dr. M'Arthur and you?

Yes; after the Masters left the Room Dr. M'Arthur came up to tell me that it was by his Authority that they were present.

Did they leave the Room immediately upon your desiring them to leave?

Yes.

What passed between yourself and Dr. M'Arthur?

I forget what were the exact Expressions that I used; but it was something to the same Effect as the Communication I made to the Masters themselves.

That you thought that you ought to be informed of the Intention?

Yes; in fact I was taken quite by Surprise, I did not know whether I ought to allow them to be there at all. Going as I did merely for the Purpose of instructing the Children, I did not know whether I ought, with the Objections that I had to the System, to take a Part in making the Masters efficient; I felt a Scruple

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

a Scruple about it, and the Result was that I told Dr. M'Arthur that I did not wish those Men to be present.

You said to make them efficient; did you consider them as coming for any other Purpose than to be taught Religion themselves?
My Understanding was, that they came to learn how to catechise the Children in the Schools to which they were to be appointed.

You did not consider them as coming for the Purpose of being themselves instructed in Religion?
No, I did not.

Were you afterwards told, or were you not, that they attended for Instruction in Religion?
I do not remember that I ever was; I have seen it stated in the Reports of the Board, but I do not remember that it was communicated to me in any other Way.

Did you persist in excluding the training Teachers from the Room where you were catechising the Children?
No, I did not persist in it.

Did you on Consideration think it better to admit them?
Yes, I did; I was advised in fact to do so by many of my clerical Friends that I had been in the habit of acting with. They seemed to think that my Scruple was of no Weight, and that for Peace sake it would be better to allow the Men to remain in the Room.

Did you intimate to any one that such was your Resolution to admit them?
I do not remember that I intimated that in any formal Way at the School; I did to Dr. Dickenson.

Who is he?
The Archbishop's Chaplain.

Did you to Dr. M'Arthur make a special Communication upon the Subject?
I do not remember that I did; indeed I am sure that I did not.

Is Dr. Dickenson employed confidentially, and does he take a considerable Part in the Business under the Archbishop; is he his confidential Chaplain?
Yes.

And Secretary?
I imagine so.

He was the Chaplain who was present subsequently when the Archbishop had Complaints read to you?
Yes.

Did those Teachers in fact come to you afterwards; after you had intimated that you were ready to let them come, did they come?
Yes, they did, but only once or twice; and I never could learn that that was in consequence of any Communication from Dr. Dickenson.

But you no longer made any Objection?
No.

How long did you continue to go to the School after you had intimated that they might attend your catechising?
I really do not remember; but I should say that it was about Three Months, but it might have been longer.

Then for the first Ten Months or Twelve Months no training Teachers had exhibited themselves in this Room?
I will not be positive upon that; I am positive that none appeared for several Months.

What aged Persons did those appear to be who presented themselves upon this Occasion when you dismissed them?
About Twenty-one or Twenty-two.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

How many were there?
Four was the largest Number, I think.

Was their Manner at all disrespectful towards you?
I thought it was.

In what respect?
I thought that their remaining when I went into the Room, which was in fact my private Room, sitting without taking the slightest Notice of me when I came in, was disrespectful, and I also thought that when I remonstrated with them for taking Possession of the Room that in their Tone of Voice there was a Want of Respect.

On that one Occasion only, or on subsequent Occasions?
Only on that one Occasion.

What you call your private Room is a Room of the School?
Yes.

But a separate Room, which you had been informed was dedicated for your Use to instruct the Children in that were to attend your Instruction?
Yes.

Was it in consequence of their disrespectful Manner that you objected to their remaining to hear you catechise the Children?
No, not merely; but the whole Thing was the Work of a Minute, and I have not a very distinct Recollection of what passed through my Mind.

They had told you that that was their Object in coming?
That is my Impression; I forget whether any thing explicit was said upon the Subject. I have no accurate Recollection of their saying that they came to hear me catechise, but I was under that Impression.

At first you thought that they were Strangers; that they were mere Intruders?
When I went into the Room I did.

When you went into the Room you regarded them as mere Intruders?
Yes; in short, I did not know who they were or what they were.

And their Manner was that of rude Intruders?
Yes, so far as I have mentioned.

That they did not rise up?
Yes; and their Appearance altogether.

Did they say any thing that was rude?
No, nothing rude; the Tone of their Voice was rude.

What did they say?
They spoke of their coming there by the Authority of Dr. M'Arthur.

And they told you that they were Teachers in the training School?
Yes.

Would you have expected, as a Clergyman of a Parish, that Dr. M'Arthur, or somebody connected with the School, would, before you had gone in, have informed you that the Intention of Dr. M'Arthur was that those Persons should be present while you were catechising the Children?
I should have expected that he should have asked my Permission. I conceive that he had no Right to send them. I felt that by Law I had the Privilege of going in to instruct the Children.

Those not being Children, you conceived that it was not fit Conduct on their Part not to take any Notice of your coming into the Room?
Yes; and coming in without my Permission.

Do you not think that it would have been an Advantage for Persons educated in the School as Teachers to have an Opportunity of acquiring a good Mode of catechising the Children?
I do think that it would be an Advantage.

Do you not think that if they had come with that Object it might have given you an Opportunity of so far benefiting them?
I should have felt, and do feel, that if I had allowed them to come in for that

that Purpose that I should be making myself a Functionary in working the Machinery of the Board.

And to that you have a conscientious Objection?
Yes.

On the Grounds urged in your Sermon?
Yes.

You have stated to the Committee that you were Fifteen Months teaching in the Model School, at the End of that Period did you find that the Children had made any Advance in Scripture Knowledge?
One or Two perhaps might; but indeed I should say more in consequence of their own Diligence than of my Instruction. One or Two Children appeared to me to be good Children.

Out of how many?
Out of the Average of Nineteen; but I should say that in general they not only did not derive much Advantage, but could not derive much Advantage.

Do you conceive that the Time allotted for Scriptural Instruction in the Model School is sufficient to enable them to obtain that Knowledge which they ought to have?
I do not.

What was the Time allotted in the Model School?
Only an Hour; that was the only Time that I and my Colleague could give to it.

The Time was limited to an Hour by your Avocations, not by any Rule of the School?
My Impression is, that there was an Hour set apart; but I have no Reason to suppose that if we had had Time we could not have had more than an Hour set apart for us.

But it was your own Avocations which limited it to an Hour, and generally Three Quarters of an Hour, not any Rule of the School?
No, I am not aware of any Rule.

What Time could you have had according to the Rules of the School?
That I do not know, for our Avocations would have prevented us from devoting more Time.

You stated in the Month of February 1832, you preached against the System of National Education in Ireland; will you state to the Committee why you preached against it?
I had Two immediate Objects. The Sermon was a Sort of Charity Sermon in aid of the Association for discountenancing Vice; it was not a regular Charity Sermon; that is, there was no Collection upon the Occasion; but I wanted to excite an Interest in my Parishioners in favour of it, and to induce them to subscribe. The other Object that I had was, to induce them to sign the Petition which was then in the course of Signature by the Inhabitants of Dublin against the System.

You stated to the Committee that you conceived that the System was calculated to promote Infidelity and Unitarianism and Popery throughout Ireland; is that your Opinion now?
It is.

At the Time you preached this Sermon do you recollect whether the Board had begun its Operations?
I do not think that the Model School was established.

You went to the Model School as soon as it was established, did you not?
As soon as it was brought to any State of Regularity.

And that was in September 1833?
Yes.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

So that you do not think it in any degree probable that the Model School was established at the Time that you preached that Sermon?
No, certainly not.

You say you consider this System of Education as likely to contribute to the Increase of Popery and Unitarianism and Infidelity; on what Ground do you suppose that it is likely to contribute to the Increase of Popery?
That was not exactly the Expression that I used; the Expression I used was, that it appeared to me to be a legal Establishment of Popery, and to give direct Encouragement to Popery.

You stated Popery, Unitarianism, and Infidelity?
I said that it tended to promote Infidelity; not that it was an Establishment of Infidelity.

That it was an Establishment of Popery and Unitarianism, and tended to promote Infidelity?
Yes.

How was it a legal Establishment of Popery?
I conceive it to be a legal Establishment of Popery in this Way;—that it is one of the Conditions insisted upon on which Aid is granted to any School, or on which any Landed Proprietor or any Person can establish a School, that the School is to be open to the Priest to teach Roman Catholic Children.

Provided there are Roman Catholic Children in it; not otherwise?
Not otherwise.

They are to teach no other Children but Roman Catholic Children; do you understand that?
Yes.

Do you consider in the same way that it gives Encouragement to Unitarianism?
Exactly in the same Way.

How is it that it promotes Infidelity?
I think that it promotes Infidelity by placing Truth and Falsehood upon a Par, by making equal Provision for the teaching of every Species of Religious Faith that may happen to be in the Country, and this being, according to Lord Stanley's Letter, making Provision for the Religious Instruction of the People, or in other Words "not overlooking the Interests of Religion;" that latter is I think the Expression used in the Letter.

Do you conceive that Roman Catholic Children ought not to be educated in their Faith?
I think a Protestant Government ought not to make Provision for their being so educated.

Do you think that a Protestant Government would act more properly by making no Provision whatever for the Education of Roman Catholic Children than by making a Provision for their being educated in the Roman Catholic Faith?
I do.

Then would you prefer that Roman Catholic Children were brought up without any Religion whatever than that they should be brought up in the Roman Catholic Faith?
I had rather that they were brought up without any Religion whatever than that I had a Hand in bringing them up Roman Catholics.

That is not a direct Answer to the Question?

[The Question is read.]

I think that it would be more proper.

Do you think that if this System was not in existence the Roman Catholic Children would have been left without any Mode of Religious Education?
No; I take it for granted that the Priests would continue giving such Instruction as they used to give.

2/5

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Do you think that they would derive any Religious Education from any other Societies supported by voluntary Contributions?

I think that Numbers of them would, because Numbers have been in attendance upon the Kildare Place Schools and other Schools where Religious Instruction is given.

Then is your Meaning this, or is it not, is your Reason for objecting to a Government making Provision for the Instruction of the Children in the Roman Catholic Faith, that you think it wrong that a Government should make Provision for the Instruction of Children in a Faith that that Government thinks false?

Certainly.

Do you read in the Letter of Lord Stanley, as One of the Rules that were laid down for the Board, that "they will also permit and encourage the Clergy to give Religious Instruction to the Children of their respective Persuasions, either before or after the ordinary School Hours, on the other Days of the Week;" does that appear to you to be giving Instruction that is at variance with the Duty of a Christian State?

It does.

And why?

I think that saying that they would encourage People to teach dangerous Religious Error is morally wrong.

Are you aware that that Word "encourage" was subsequently explained?

I do remember that.

Was that Explanation given at a subsequent Period to this Sermon of yours being preached?

I do not know.

Did that Explanation make any Difference in your Feelings with regard to the System?

No; it was very lately indeed that I saw that Explanation; it was within the last Fortnight that I saw it.

Has it now made any Difference?

Not at all.

Were you at all acquainted with the Proceedings of the Kildare Place System?

I cannot say that I was extensively.

Did you discourage it in any Manner in your Parish?

It depends upon what is meant by the Word discourage.

Did you discourage the Attendance of the Children under your Influence upon the Schools of the Kildare Place System?

I have frequently advised the Parents of the Children of my own District, where I have a School exclusively for Protestant Children, who were in attendance upon the Kildare Place Model School, not to send them to that School.

Then in fact you continued opposed to the Kildare Place System as far as your Influence with the Children under your Guidance went?

I objected to the Three fundamental Rules of the Kildare Place Society.

Did you consider that under Lord Stanley's Letter to the Duke of Leinster the Rule that has just been read, "they will also permit and encourage the Clergy to give Religious Instruction to the Children of their respective Persuasions, either before or after the ordinary School Hours, on the other Days of the Week," gave you, as a Clergyman, a Right to teach the Children of the Established Church in your Parish, even though you thought it necessary to warn the Parents in your Parish against sending them to the School?

I did, and do think so.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Did you ever recommend the Parent of any Child attending the National School to withdraw that Child from the National School?

Yes, I did; it was in consequence of that that the Archbishop recommended me to resign.

What were the Grounds upon which you recommended the Parent so to withdraw the Child?

Really I cannot say at this Moment that I recollect the Details of the Conversations, but I had very strong Objections both to the Principle of the System generally, and also very strong Objections to the Model School.

And you stated those Reasons to the Parents as a Motive for withdrawing the Children?

I suppose that I did; I cannot say positively what I said.

Have you any Reason to doubt that you assigned such Reasons?

I do not know that in every Instance I went into minor Details; I did not find any great Reluctance upon their Parts to take my Advice.

And in point of fact they did so withdraw their Children under your Recommendation?

Yes.

When you found that the Attendance of many of the Children was irregular at the Model School, as you have stated you found it to be, did you make any Representation upon that Subject to Doctor Macarthur, the Master?

I do not remember that I did; I was under the Impression that that would be a Thing that the Master could not interfere in consistently with the general Principles of the Institution, and in point of fact I believe that Doctor Macarthur did not know who were Protestants and who were Roman Catholics.

Are you sure that you did not make any Representation?

I do not think that I ever communicated with Dr. Macarthur upon the Subject.

Are you not aware that the Board had intimated their Intention, under the Rules of the School, to encourage the Attendance of Religious Teachers, both of the Protestant and Catholic Persuasion, upon the respective Children that belonged to those Persuasions?

It is Part of their Rules that they will encourage the Clergy to give Instruction.

To whom?

To the Children of their respective Persuasions.

And the Children of course to attend those Instructions?

Yes; but there is no Compulsion, I have always understood.

What led you to think that Dr. Macarthur had not the Means of inducing the Children of the School to attend you and other Teachers professing the Persuasion to which the Children belonged?

I should think that if the Children did not take my Advice upon the Subject they would not be very likely to take his.

You thought that the Children were not sufficiently under the Control of the Master for that Purpose?

I really cannot say that I have a very accurate Recollection of what passed through my Mind upon the Subject. I do not recollect that I did ever apply to Dr. Macarthur to use any Influence with the Children, and I have a general Impression upon my Mind that that was a sort of thing in which he could not use Compulsion; I remember hearing from my Colleague that he spoke upon the Subject, and that he was informed that they had no Means of enforcing it.

Was your Reason for not speaking to Dr. Macarthur, that you had been told by some one that he had made such a Declaration?

No, I cannot say that it was.

Did it influence you not to speak upon the Subject?

I cannot say that it did, because it might have been subsequently that I heard

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

heard that Fact. It is now upwards of Two Years since I was at the School, and I have not a very accurate Recollection of several minor Points.

Did you think it advantageous that the Children should attend for the Purpose of being instructed by you on the Occasions in which you frequented the School for that Purpose?

I thought it advantageous, but not very advantageous, because I did not conceive that in the course of One Hour in the Week, with Children of such different Ages, it could be of great Benefit.

You did not consider it sufficiently advantageous to induce you to secure their Attendance?

It might have contributed to making me less zealous to secure their Attendance, but they were not within my own Parish, except a few, and those few I advised the Parents to withdraw, and succeeded in placing them in better Schools.

Then having been the Means of withdrawing from the School those Children that belonged to your own Parish, you did not consider it necessary to make any Effort for securing the Attendance of other Children not belonging to the Parish, though the School was situated in it?

I fact I could not, because they came from all Parts of the City.

Did you use any Effort to call in the Authority of others to procure that Attendance?

No, certainly not. There are Two Things to be understood by trying to get the Children to attend; one is inducing them to come to the School, and the other is inducing them, when in the School, to come in and attend the Clergyman. The latter I might have spoken about; but as to using any Influence with the Schoolmaster to try to get the Children to attend the School, that I did not.

The Question was, whether you used any Effort to get the Children to attend upon you when you gave Instruction?

No, I should think not; I never heard of a Protestant Child who was at the School on the Day I attended not coming in to my Class.

But you have stated that the Attendance of the Children was irregular; do you mean by that that the Attendance of the Children at the School was irregular, or that their Attendance was irregular as applied to their Attendance upon you?

As applied to me, for I had no Means of knowing whether they were in the School or not.

But you have stated that you have no Reason to think that any Child being in the School of the Protestant Religion did not attend your Class at the Time that you went there, have you not?

I do not remember that I ever heard of a Case of Children of the Church of England attending School and not coming in to me.

Then what did you mean by stating, in an early Part of the Examination, that the Attendance of the Children upon you was irregular?

That they were sometimes Nineteen, and sometimes Fifteen, and sometimes Twenty, and so on.

Then you attribute that Irregularity to their not being in the School on those Days?

The Fact is, that I did not know; but I took it for granted that all the Protestant Children in attendance at the School on each Day came in to me.

Did you think much about it?

I did not, to say the Truth.

On what Day of the Week was it that you gave Religious Instruction?

Saturday.

They would be there for no other Purpose on the Saturday; Saturday is not an ordinary Day for School Instruction; they only come on Saturday to receive Religious Instruction; is not that the Case?

No, I am not aware of that.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

After having objected to the Attendance of Teachers in training upon your Class, you changed your Opinion upon that Subject after communicating with those with whom you generally act; did you desire Dr. Dickenson to communicate that Change of Opinion to Dr. Macarthur?

No, I am sure that I did not put it in that Way, but the Masters attended, and therefore I took it for granted that a Communication had been made; it was merely in the Way of private Conversation with Dr. Dickenson that I stated my Change of Opinion.

You state now that the Masters attended; you stated in a former Part of your Examination that they did not attend with any Regularity afterwards?

No, they did not.

Then why have you conceived yourself warranted in believing that that Communication was made; you say that you felt warranted in believing that that Communication had been made because the Masters did attend, and you afterwards stated that they very seldom did attend?

But I should say that their attending at all, after my positive Refusal to let them, was a Proof that Dr. Macarthur had understood that I would not in future object.

Having withdrawn your Objection to their attending at all, and finding that they attended only partially, did you make any Representation to Dr. Macarthur upon the Subject of their not regularly attending?

No, I did not.

Up to this Period, which was Ten Months after you entered upon the Instruction, no one Case occurred of the training Teachers coming to the Room where you taught the Children?

No.

You have no Doubt in your own Mind, that though you had made no direct Communication upon the Subject, they had been informed that you were willing that they should be in attendance?

I took it for granted from the Fact of their being there after I had once refused them, that Dr. Macarthur was aware that I would not object to their coming.

You have stated that the Time in which you attended the School for the Purpose of giving Instruction was not in your Opinion sufficient for the Purpose of affording adequate Religious Instruction; was there any Occasion upon which you were told that additional Time could not be given or upon which you were curtailed in that Degree of Attendance which you conceived necessary?

No.

But your other Avocations were such that if you could have had the whole Week you could have devoted only a single Hour to this Instruction?

Yes.

But supposing that you had had more Time, you have no Reason to think, from any Interference that was ever used with you at the School, that that Time would not have been given?

No, I have not.

Have you read the "Scripture Extracts" that are printed and used in the Schools?

I have not read them through; I have read Portions of them.

Have you read enough of them to enable you to judge of the general Tendency of the Religious Instruction which they afford?

Yes, I should say I have, judging from the Extracts that have as yet appeared; the Commencement of a Series, as I am told.

Are you of opinion that those "Extracts," as a Scheme of Religious Instruction, are calculated to promote Infidelity?

I think not, the Portions of Scripture taken by themselves; of course no Part of Scripture could be calculated to promote Infidelity; but taking those

Extracts

Extracts with the accompanying Notes and the new Translation of them I think that they are Books that I should not use. *Rev. F. B. Woodward.*

The Question is, not whether they are Books that you would recommend, but whether they are Books which in your Opinion are calculated to promote Infidelity?

I think that they are more calculated to promote Popery. The only Way in which they could promote Infidelity is by unsettling the Minds of the Children, and making them distrust the Authorized Version of the Scriptures; I do not see any direct Tendency in them to promote Infidelity.

Is there any other Part of the System of Instruction in the School besides those "Scripture Extracts" that you think calculated to promote Infidelity?

I think that the Principle of all Religions being treated alike is calculated to promote Infidelity, and that in a mixed School, where there are Unitarian Children and Roman Catholic Children, and Children of the Church of England and other Denominations, all the Ministers of those respective Denominations being equally encouraged, and their Instructions being equally pronounced to be Religious Instruction, is calculated to promote Infidelity.

You think that any System of Education to which a Roman Catholic or a Person not of the Church of England is admitted in common with the Children of the Church of England is calculated to promote Infidelity?

No, I did not say that.

Will you explain what you did say?

I do not think, for instance, that an orthodox Presbyterian Minister joining with a Clergyman of the Church of England in carrying on a System of Religious Instruction is calculated to promote Infidelity; it is not the System that I should like best, for I should like it to be exclusively Church of England Instruction; but I do not see any Tendency in it to promote Infidelity; it might tend to make the Children bad Churchmen, but not Infidels.

Do you think that a System which enforces the teaching of Moral and Literary Instruction, and abstains from enforcing any Religious Instruction whatever, is likely to promote Infidelity?

I always felt that to be a difficult Question, and should prefer not answering it.

Do you consider that no useful Religious Instruction whatever is conveyed in the Scripture Extracts as used by the National School?

The Extracts from the Scripture must contain a vast deal that is very useful, but I think that the Utility of them is very much impeded, first of all by the Notes, and then by the Translation.

Should you say that in Schools in which those Scripture Extracts are used all Religious Instruction whatsoever is excluded?

According to the Principles of the Board I should say it, because they say it themselves.

Where do you find that they say that all Religious Instruction whatsoever is excluded from their Schools?

I understood the Question to mean where the Scripture Extracts exclusively were used, and no other Religious Instruction was given; if that was not the Question then I would beg to withdraw my Answer.

Will you attend to Part of the Examination of Mr. Blake before the House of Commons on the 17th of August 1835, when this Question is put to him: No. 4,123. "Would you propose to give any Religious Instruction in the National Schools?" The Answer given is, "It would be directly contrary to our first Principle." Was that the Kind of Principle that you thought the Board maintained; is it to that you alluded in your Answer, when you stated that you took it from the Commissioners themselves?

No.

It was a general Impression upon your Mind that such was the Principle of the Board?

I misunderstood the Question; I thought the Question was whether in Schools in which no Religious Instruction was given except the Scripture

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Extracts, whether I should say that Religious Instruction was excluded from those Schools; and to that I answer that I should. It follows from the Principles of the Commissioners; for they say that the Scripture Extracts are only to be used in the combined Moral and Literary Education, and do not form Part of the Religious Education of the Children.

Will you read the Questions and Answers 4,122 and 4,123, and say whether those Questions and Answers would confirm those Opinions of yours, or contradict them?

"For Admission to this Normal School would you require any Religious Qualification?—No." "Would you propose to give any Religious Instruction in the Normal Schools?—It would be directly contrary to our first Principle."

Does that confirm you in the Opinion, that the Board exclude Religious Instruction, or that it does not?

It does.

Do you conceive by that Answer all Religious Instruction was meant, or only Religious Instruction in one particular Creed?

I have not read the Context in which those Questions and Answers occur. I should imagine that it means during the united Education of the Children.

Whatever Objections you may feel to a System of Moral and Literary Education in common Form, which while engaged in common Religious Instruction is excluded, should you consider that if combined with an efficient System of separate Religious Instruction, daily carried on, such a System was likely to spread Infidelity?

I should. I think that the Principle of considering all Religions as equally true or equally untrue, whichever it may be, is an infidel Principle.

How is such a Principle as that proclaimed?

There is this Passage in Lord Stanley's Letter:—"For the Success of the Undertaking much must depend upon the Character of the Individuals who compose the Board, and upon the Security thereby afforded to the Country, that while the Interests of Religion are not overlooked, the most scrupulous Care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar Tenets of any Description of Christian Pupils." There One of the main Objects of the Institution is to see that the Interests of Religion are not overlooked; the Manner in which that is provided for is, by requiring that the School shall be kept open for a certain Number of Hours, or a certain Time, for Moral and Literary Education only, and requiring that the remaining One or Two Days shall be given to such Religious Education as is to be approved of by the Clergy of the respective Parties. That appears to me to be putting Christianity and Unitarianism, Protestantism and Popery, upon a Par; and I think that that Principle, spread throughout the Country, is calculated decidedly to promote Infidelity.

You have also stated that you consider this System as likely to spread Popery in Ireland; do you consider that the Scripture Extracts are likely to be the Means of spreading Popery in Ireland; and if you so consider, why do you consider it?

In the first place, I consider that many of the Notes are calculated to spread Popery. There is a Note that has been spoken of a good deal, upon a Translation that the Commissioners have adopted; the Word "Repentance;" the Note that they give upon that Word showing their Reasons for preferring "Repentance" to "Penance" I can understand in no other Way than as a Popish Comment upon the Word.

Is not the Protestant Translation adhered to in preference to the Roman Catholic?

It is; but it is the Note that I refer to.

The Word which in the Roman Catholic Translation is translated "Penance" in the Protestant is translated "Repentance"?

It is.

Will you read the Note to which you refer?

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

"The Greek Word here rendered 'Repentance,' as well as the Kindred Verb rendered 'repent,' is in this and several other Passages translated in the Vulgate Latin by 'Penitentia,' and the Rheims Version by the English Word (derived from that) 'Penance,' which is contracted from 'Penitence.' We shall render the Greek Words in question by the English Words 'Repentance' or 'Penitence' and 'repent;' for Roman Catholics, including under the Words Repentance or Penitence not only internal Sorrow for Sin, with Purpose of future Amendment, but also a Disposition on the Part of the Penitent to manifest his inward Sorrow for Sin by penitential Works, do in fact include in the Word 'repent' all that they mean by the Phrase 'do Penance;' whereas, although the Word 'Penance' according to Roman Catholic Doctrine essentially implies internal Sorrow for Sin, it conveys to Protestants only the Idea of certain Austerities or voluntary Sufferings, or at least certain Exercises peculiar to the Church of Rome. It is obvious, therefore, that while Roman Catholics are in no Danger of being misled by the Use of the Words 'Repentance' or 'Penitence,' Protestants would be in danger of being misled by the Use of the Words 'Penance' and 'do Penance.'"

Your Opinion that those Scripture Extracts have a Tendency to promote Popery is very much founded upon the Statement in that Note explanatory of what the Roman Catholic Meaning is?

I did not exactly say that it was in a great measure owing to that Note; but it was the first Thing that came into my Head when the Question was put to me.

Whatever Objections you may have to the present Scripture Extracts, is it your Opinion that if a Body of Scripture Extracts, free from such Notes, was to be published, it would have the Effect of giving a Taste to the Roman Catholic Children for the reading of the whole Scripture or not?

Yes; I should think that if they liked the Extracts of course they would wish to have more.

Would that be for the Advantage of Popery or not, in your Opinion?

I should think not.

Are you aware that it is a Principle of the Roman Catholic Church that the Scriptures cannot be put into the Hands of Children without Notes?

I am.

Then does it appear to you that the Case proposed to you of Scripture Extracts put into the Hands of Roman Catholics free from those Notes is one which can occur?

I should imagine certainly not, with the Consent of the Roman Catholic Clergy.

Will you look at Lord Stanley's Letter at the Beginning, and see what he says in the Part of it which alludes to the Roman Catholic Objections to the Scriptures without Notes?

"One of its leading Principles," that is, the Principles of the Kildare Place Society, "was calculated to defeat its avowed Objects, as Experience has subsequently proved that it has. The Determination to enforce in all their Schools the reading of the Holy Scriptures without Note or Comment was undoubtedly taken with the purest Motives, with the Wish at once to connect Religious with Moral and Literary Education, and at the same Time not to run the Risk of wounding the peculiar Feelings of any Sect by Catechetical Instruction or Comments which might tend to Subjects of Polemical Controversy; but it seems to have been overlooked that the Principles of the Roman Catholic Church (to which in any System intended for general Diffusion throughout Ireland the Bulk of the Pupils must necessarily belong) were totally at variance with this Principle, and that the indiscriminate reading of the Holy Scriptures without Note or Comment, by Children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a Church which denies, even to Adults, the Right of unaided private Interpretation of the Sacred Volume with respect to Articles of Religious Belief."

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Have you ever heard of Schools now existing in Ireland where the whole Scripture, and that the Authorized Version, is used, at which Schools Roman Catholic Children attend without any Impediment on the Part of the Priests?

I know Schools where Roman Catholic Children attend without any successful Opposition on the Part of the Priests.

Have you ever heard of any Schools in Ireland or elsewhere where Roman Catholic Children do attend with the Consent of their Priests and Bishops?

I am not aware that there are such.

You have stated that the Notes in those Scripture Extracts lead you to consider the Work as generally favourable to the Advancement of Popery?

I would qualify that; I do not say that the Notes are generally favourable.

But that many Notes are?

Yes.

Will you read the Note in the First Volume of the Extracts from the Old Testament, on the Third Chapter of Genesis and the Fifteenth Verse?

"*It shall crush, &c.—ipsa, she,*—the Woman; so divers of the Fathers read this Place conformably to the Latin; others read it *ipsum*, viz. the Seed. The Sense is the same, for it is by her Seed, *Jesus Christ*, that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head."

Do you consider that Note as favourable to Popery?

I do.

Why?

Because it asserts that the crushing of the Serpent's Head was the Work of the Woman.

Are you a Hebrew Scholar; do you understand Hebrew?

Very little indeed.

Does it say how the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head?

By Jesus Christ.

Do you consider that as making Jesus Christ the Instrument of the Woman?

That is the Sense of the Words.

That is the Sense in which you understand them?

It would be a Degree of Blasphemy that one can hardly suppose that the Framers of that Note really meant to advance such a Proposition as that our Blessed Lord was only an Instrument in the Hands of a Woman for the Redemption of the World; but the Object of the Note, as extracted from the Douay Version, was, I think, to exalt the Character of the Virgin Mary.

But beyond exalting the Character of the Virgin Mary you think that it bears the obvious Interpretation put upon it in the Question recently put to you?

I do.

Is there any Doubt as to the Woman who is intended to be designated in that Note, supposing that it is translated "she"?

I never heard that it was doubted.

Will you read the Verse?

"I will put Enmities between thee and the Woman, and between her Seed and thy Seed; it shall crush thy Head, and thou shalt lie in wait for his Heel."

What Woman is meant in the first Passage: "I will put Enmities between thee and the Woman"?

To say the Truth, I never understood the Note in any other Sense than I have mentioned, nor did I ever hear that it was doubted that the Meaning and Intention of that Note in the Douay Version was to elevate the Virgin Mary.

Will you read the Verse again?
"I will put Enmities between thee and the Woman."

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

What Woman is there meant?
Eve, certainly; "and between her Seed and thy Seed; it shall crush thy Head."

Do you, now that you have read this Passage again, entertain the same Opinion, that it is the Virgin Mary that is meant in the Note?
I do.

Do you mean that in that Verse "she" means the Virgin Mary?
No, not in that Verse, but in the Note.

Is the Virgin Mary named in the Note?
No.

Is there any Reference to the Virgin Mary in the Note?
No.

Has there been any Reference to the Virgin Mary in that Volume?
No.

Has the Virgin Mary been named in that Place?
No; but the Note is extracted from the Douay Version.

Does the Note mention the Virgin Mary?
No.

Are you aware that in the List of Books or Tracts employed in the Schools in the separate Religious Instruction with the Sanction or Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended there are these Two Books, Reeves's History of the Old and New Testament, Gahan's ditto ditto?
I think I have seen those Names.

Are you aware that in both those Books used in the Schools in the separate Religious Instruction, with the Sanction or Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended, it is distinctly said that the Woman who crushes the Serpent's Head is the Virgin Mary?
I was not aware with respect to those Books; I was aware that it had been explicitly laid down by Roman Catholic Controversialists.

And it is because you are aware that it has been laid down by Roman Catholic Controversialists, that it is the Virgin Mary that is here meant, and this Note being taken from the Douay Version, that you consider the Virgin Mary is referred to in the Note?
Yes.

Therefore you suppose that a Person having read this Note up to this Point, the Virgin Mary not having been introduced or named, must understand from that Note the Virgin Mary?
No; I cannot exactly say that a Person who had never read any thing upon the Roman Catholic Doctrine would so understand it.

Why do you say that you believe that that Note is calculated to exalt the Virgin Mary in the Opinion of those who read that Book?
Because the Roman Catholic Population in Ireland in general are very well-informed upon controversial Subjects.

Do you mean to say that it will convert Roman Catholics to Roman Catholicism?
No.

You mean to say that it will pervert the Protestant Children to Roman Catholicism?
I think it may have that Tendency.

How will it have that Tendency? In consequence of Roman Catholic Children being well instructed in the Roman Catholic Doctrine with respect to this Exaltation of the Virgin Mary?
Roman Catholic Children and other Roman Catholics in talking to Protestants,

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

testants, as of course they often do, upon Religious Subjects, will be able to point to the Authority of the Commissioners, that the Sense is the same; that it is by Christ that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head.

Then you think that the Effect will be produced by the Children in the School conversing with each other upon scriptural Subjects?
That may be one Way.

Do you think it probable that they will have a great deal of that Conversation?
Indeed I should think it is very likely.

What is the other Way?
Grown Roman Catholics, not merely Children, may converse on the Subject; we know that there are Numbers of Persons of the Roman Catholic Church that are very zealous, and I am not finding Fault with them for that, in endeavouring to make Proselytes to their Faith; there are a great Number of Agents at work throughout the Country, and I think that that, being under the Authority of the Commissioners, might be made use of by them.

Then you think that those active Agents will point out that Passage as meaning to exalt the Virgin Mary?
I think they may.

Do not you think that Persons to whom that should be pointed out would immediately say there is no Virgin Mary named; the "she" that is named is Eve?
I think that they might make this Reply, but I do not think it will follow that they will; People are not always clear Thinkers.

Would it not be an effectual Answer; would it be an Answer that could not be replied upon?
I think in the Way of mere reasoning it would, but I do not think that it would satisfy People's Minds, because if any Woman is in question at all People would be more likely to suppose the Virgin Mary than Eve.

All reasoning apart, does not the correct grammatical Construction of the Sentence indisputably make those Pronouns relative to Eve? "It shall crush &c.—ipsa, she,—the Woman; so divers of the Fathers read this Place conformably to the Latin; others read it ipsum, viz. the Seed. The Sense is the same; for it is by her Seed, Jesus Christ, that the Woman crushes the Serpent's Head." Construing the whole grammatically, according to the Rules of Grammar, does not it refer to Eve?
Yes, I should say that grammatically speaking it does.

Have you not up to the present Moment referred it in fact to the Virgin Mary in your own reading?
Yes; I conceived that the Framer of the Passage referred it to the Virgin Mary.

Have you not found that vast Numbers of other Persons did the same Thing?
Yes, I believe so.

And the Danger then to which you have adverted you conceive to arise from the general Tendency that there is so to understand the Meaning of the Note?
Yes.

You have heard it stated that one of the Books authorized for Religious Instruction says that it is intended for the Virgin Mary; you also know that the Roman Catholic Controversialists state that it means the Virgin Mary?
I did not say that I knew that One of the Books contained that Statement.

If that is the Fact, that that Book does so state it, is not it the Effect of the Note to support that Statement, which you consider a false Interpretation, by the Authority of Scripture?
I should say certainly.

You are not a Hebrew Scholar?
No.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

You do not know from your own Knowledge of Hebrew which is the right Interpretation?
I have no Doubt whatever that "she" is wrong; that it is "he" in the Original.

Are you sufficiently a Hebrew Scholar to be able to form an Opinion?
I cannot say that I ever examined it; I have taken it upon Trust.

Not from personal Examination of the Text?
No, I really cannot say that; I never did examine it; I think I know enough of Hebrew to ascertain the right Interpretation, but it is One of those Things that one may safely take upon Trust when a Hebrew Scholar asserts it.

You take it upon Trust upon the Authority of the Authorized Translation of your Church?
Yes.

Does the Authorized Version adopt either the Masculine or the Feminine?
It certainly does not adopt the Feminine.

Are you aware that any high Authorities in the Church of England have differed upon the Subject of that Translation?
No, I am not.

During the course of your Attendance for the Purpose of Religious Instruction given to Protestant Children in the National School have you met with any Instance in which any one of those Protestant Children have formed erroneous Religious Opinions from Conversation with the Catholic Children upon any of the Subjects adverted to in the Notes of the Scripture Extracts?
No.

Do you think that the Roman Catholic Children of Ireland are more likely to be made acquainted with a saving Knowledge of the Gospel of Christ by this System of Education, or if this System of Education had never been adopted, and they had been left to the Care of voluntary Societies, such as had existed in Ireland previously?
I should say, if they had been left to the Care of voluntary Societies that they would have been more likely to be brought to a saving Knowledge of the Gospel of Christ.

How do you think that they would have been brought to that Knowledge?
I have been asked which of the Two Modes of Education is the best adapted for that End. I do not think that mere School Education alone would give them that Knowledge; but I think that they would have acquired more of Scriptural Knowledge if the National Board had not been instituted.

In a former Part of your Examination you have said, that if the State had not interfered the Roman Catholic Children would have been better instructed by the old System of Education; to what System of Education do you allude?
I alluded to the various Societies that are in existence; the Kildare Place Society, and the Association for the discountenancing of Vice, and the Hibernian Society.

Did you not say that you objected equally to the Kildare Place Society as to the National Board?
No.

Do you conceive that under all those voluntary Societies they would have been more likely to obtain Religious Instruction than under this National Society?
Yes. My Objection to the Kildare Place Society was to their leading Principles; but the Fact is, that those Principles are so general that if a Protestant Clergyman had a School under that Society he really could convert it into an Engine, without infringing upon their Principles, of wide-spread Dissemination of Religious Truth among the Children.

Rev. F. B. Woodward.

Do you think that in point of fact when the Education was dependent upon those voluntary Societies, and previously to the Establishment of the Board, the Roman Catholic Children did obtain throughout Ireland purer Religious Instruction?

I should think so.

Speaking in reference to the whole Population of Ireland?

I fancy that there were not such a large Number of Children at the Kildare Place Schools, and the Schools of the Association for discountenancing Vice, as there are at the National Schools; but I should say that the Quality of Religious Instruction given was in itself better, and that the other Societies were not liable to the Objection I have before stated, of communicating Religious Instruction with Religious Error.

You have stated that if the Roman Catholic Children did not obtain Education in this Mode they would obtain it through their Priests; do you consider that the Education which they would obtain through their Priests exclusively is preferable to that which they would obtain under the National System?

The Answer to which Allusion is made in the Question had reference to Religious Instruction. I should think that the Religious Instruction given by the Priests at their Chapels, or wherever else they used to assemble the Children, was as good as that now given in the Schools.

Do you think that it would be better?

I have no Reason to suppose that it would differ.

Do you think that it would be more desirable that the Mass of the Population of Ireland should receive that exclusive Instruction from the Priests, or partake of the Instruction of the National School?

I think that it would be better, as I stated, for the Government to leave the Children altogether without Instruction than to give direct Support to the Roman Catholic Religion; but in reference to the Question whether it might be better for any individual Child to be permitted to grow up as a Heathen or to be educated a Roman Catholic, I should say it would be better to be educated as a Roman Catholic.

You make a Distinction between what is good for the whole of the Individuals of which a Community is composed in their individual Capacity, and that which is desirable for the Government to promote in that Community at large?

I make a Distinction between what may be abstractedly good, and what, looking at it as connected with Morals, it may be right in the Government or any Individual to take part in.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Rev. W. Maturin.

The Reverend WILLIAM MATURIN is called in, and examined as follows:

You are Curate of the District of St. Stephen's, which is Part of the Rectory of St. Peter's?

Yes.

Were you at any Time desired by any Person to take part in the Religious Instruction of the Children of the Established Church in the Model School in Dublin?

The Archdeacon of Dublin communicated, through my Brother Curate, his Desire to know whether I would, as Clergyman of the Parish, attend at the Model School to give Instruction to the Protestant Children.

Did you consent?

I did.

Did you in consequence attend regularly?

I should say I attended with great Regularity.

How often did you attend?

At first I was in the habit of attending on alternate Weeks with my Brother Clergyman;

Rev. W. Mathrin.

Clergyman; after a Time he ceased to attend, and the whole Attendance devolved upon me, and I then attended regularly every Week on One Day for about Three Quarters of an Hour.

Were there many young People of your own Parish that attended?
I am not aware of any.

How many Protestant Children came to you as being in attendance upon that School?
When first I commenced the Attendance I requested the Master to provide me with a Book containing a List of the Names of all the Protestant Children in the School; I should say that the Number upon the Book was about Thirty; the Number that attended did not form more than an Average of Sixteen of these during the whole Time.

Did those Sixteen attend regularly?
I should say that they did tolerably.

Did they when they attended learn readily and well?
It will be necessary for me to mention the Instruction which I gave them; Part of the Instruction they could not refuse to learn. When I catechised them from the Scripture they read from the Book, and I at the same Time catechised them upon the Meaning of what they read. I instructed them in the Church Catechism, which I found it very difficult to get them to commit to Memory; and I also gave them some Prayers to commit to Memory, and found it extremely difficult to prevail upon them to do so.

In what did the Difficulty consist?
In a Sort of Negligence; they appeared unwilling to commit them to Memory.

Did that appear to arise from their considering that they came there of their own Accord?
I think so.

You understood them as coming as Volunteers?
I mentioned to the Master of the School that their Attendance was very irregular, and he said that there was no Means of securing their Attendance.

That they might attend or not as they pleased?
Exactly.

Of what Age were those Children generally?
I should say from about Seven to Fourteen or Fifteen.

They varied in their Ages?
Yes, they were of all the intermediate Ages.

Upon the whole had you the Satisfaction of feeling that you gave a considerable Degree of Religious Instruction to those Children?
No; I cannot say that I felt that there was sufficient Religious Instruction even for that small Number, especially as I could not secure that the Instruction which I did give them was all learnt.

You only gave Three Quarters of an Hour; why did you not give more than Three Quarters of an Hour a Week?
There were other Institutions in the Parish which I felt myself more called upon to attend to, they being more immediately under my Care.

And the Protestant Children of this School were not your Parishioners?
Not any of them, as far as I recollect.

While you were there did any of the training Teachers ever attend your Religious Instruction?
Occasionally a very small Number of Persons, whom I understood to be the training Teachers, dropped in.

Did you repel them?
No; on One Occasion I recollect having spoken to the Master of the School, and asked him why they were not regular in their Attendance; and he

Rev. W. Maturin.

he mentioned to me upon that Occasion, that they were receiving Instruction from some Literary or Scientific Lecturer, as the Reason for their not attending me.

In fact they were giving the Preference to some Literary or Scientific Instruction at the Time which was set apart for your giving them Religious Instruction?

The Hour was set apart for instructing the Children, although when there were Teachers at the School they might avail themselves of it.

Did you understand that this was on the Day which was set apart in the Model School for separate Religious Instruction; did you understand that there is a Day set apart in the Model School for separate Religious Instruction?

I did so understand; but I should suppose that the Day on which I gave Religious Instruction was not particularly set apart, from the Circumstance of the Children attending the School on the same Day.

Then you do not know whether according to the Rules of the School the Day on which you gave this Religious Instruction was the Day that was set apart for Religious Instruction?

No.

Were you ever told that it was not?

No.

Was any Remonstrance ever made with you for not coming to give Religious Instruction on the Day of separate Religious Instruction?

No.

What was the Day; was it Saturday?

The Day changed; at first when I attended the Model School the Day fixed was Saturday. I believe that the Children attended School on that Day, but I am not certain. I found it inconvenient to attend on Saturday, and I requested the Master to allow me to fix on another Day, and I then chose Tuesday, and was in the habit of attending from Three o'Clock on Tuesday to a Quarter before Four.

Did you choose the Saturday?

As well as I recollect, the Day was mentioned to me as the most convenient.

Tuesday was your Choice?

Yes.

Was the Hour your Choice?

Yes.

When the Persons whom you consider to be training Masters attended your Class, did you consider that they attended for the Purpose of receiving elementary Instruction themselves or merely of acquiring Knowledge as to the Method of teaching it to others?

I did not make any Inquiries upon the Subject; I permitted them to remain present while I was instructing the Children, and my habit always is when grown Persons attend the Instruction which I give to Children not to ask them Questions or catechise them with the Children.

But you considered their Object to be to qualify themselves as training Masters?

I knew that they were training Masters. I might have considered their Object to be both to receive Instruction as to how they were to teach and also to receive personal Religious Instruction.

You said that you complained to the Head Master Dr. Macarthur of the irregular Manner in which those training Teachers attended, and he explained it upon one Occasion by their attending a Literary Lecture; did you in fact find that those training Teachers after that came more regularly?

As well as I can recollect they did not attend more regularly afterwards.

How many at the utmost ever came to you at once?

It is very difficult for me to say exactly, but I should conceive about Six or Seven was the greatest Number.

Did

Rev. W. Maturin.

Did any one of them ever apply to you to assist him in Religious Instruction?
No.

On the Days that you attended the School of the National System, did you attend any other School?
No, on neither Day.

What were chiefly your Occupations on that Day which prevented your giving longer Time to the School?
Parochial Duties.

Did you ever find any Objection made at the School to the Time that you allotted there to the Religious Instruction of the Protestant Children being too short?
Never.

Or to its being too long?
Never.

You might have extended the Time if you had Leisure for the Purpose?
Yes.

You say that the Children were very slow at learning Things by heart. You gave them a Lesson on Saturday, and wished them to repeat it on the following Saturday?
Yes.

And you found that they had not learnt it?
Except in Cases where they had done it from Persuasion.

You know Mr. Woodward; have you the same Feelings in respect to this Plan of Education with Mr. Woodward?
I believe my Feelings of Dissatisfaction are the same.

So far as you know, is there any Provision whatever made for Attendance on Divine Worship on Sundays or at any other Time of Children of the Church of England in the Model Schools or of the training Teachers?
I know of no such Provision being made.

Do you recollect ever to have noticed the training Teachers attending at your Church on Sundays?
I never did; but I should add that it would be very unlikely that I should observe them.

Should you have known them if you had seen them in Church?
Perhaps I might.

Were you cognizant of the Persons of all the Teachers?
At the Time it is very probable that I was acquainted with the Persons of those that came to me; I naturally observed them, but I could not at all say that I should recognize them in Church.

You say from Six to Seven attended?
Yes.

Should you have known those Six or Seven if you had seen them in Church?
I might have known them, but I cannot say that I should.

They might have been at Church without your seeing them?
Yes.

Are you still in the same Curacy?
Yes.

Do you attend the School now?
The Model School is removed from the Parish.

Did you on the Days you attended the School go into the School itself, or direct to the Room set apart for Religious Instruction?
I went direct to the Room set apart for Religious Instruction.

Rev. W. Maturin.

Did you go into the School either before or after the Hour set apart for Religious Instruction?

I am not aware of doing so, but I went to the School at other Times.

Did you continue that Duty as long as the School remained in that Parish?

I did.

You were always treated in the Model School with the Respect due to a Clergyman?

There never was any Opportunity of treating me otherwise, for I went direct to the Room where I instructed the Children.

You never met with any Disrespect?

No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 10° *Aprilis* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland

The Reverend FRANCIS BLAKE WOODWARD is called in, and further examined as follows: *Rev. F. B. Woodward.*

Is there any Answer you have given on which you wish to make an Explanation; if so, you are at liberty to do so?

An Answer that is given makes me state, what at the Time I did not intend to state, that I conceived abstractedly it would be better for Roman Catholic Children to be brought up without any Religion at all than to be brought up in the Roman Catholic Faith. What I intended to state was, that I conceived it would be better for the Government to leave them without any Religious Education at all than to take Part in bringing them up Roman Catholics.

You do not mean to say you think it better they should have no Religious Education at all than that they should be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith?

No. I merely meant that I thought it would be better for the Government to leave them (and I would apply the same to Individuals) without Religious Education, or without any Education at all, than to take a Part in bringing them up Roman Catholics.

Would you then be of opinion that as there may be a better or a worse Education in the Roman Catholic Faith, it would be better for the Government to leave them to have the worse Education in the Roman Catholic Faith, than to interfere to give them the better Education in the Roman Catholic Faith, they being the greater Proportion of the Population of the Country?

Yes; I think it would be better for the Government to leave them without any Education whatsoever than to take a Part in teaching what I conceive to be Religious Error to them.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

ALEXANDER M'ARTHUR, M.D., is called in, and examined as follows: *A. M'Arthur, M.D.*

What is your Office under the Commissioners of National Education?

The Superintendence of the Male and Female Schools, and the Training Department.

How long have you filled that Situation?

Since a few Months after the Board began its Operations; the Male School opened on the 8th of March 1833, and the Female School opened on April the 15th.

When did the Model School open?

I consider them both as Model Schools.

When did they commence receiving Persons for the Purpose of training them as Masters?

The First Class came up on the 10th of February 1834.

Were you engaged in Education previous to your undertaking the Duties of the Situation?

I have been engaged in Education for about Fifteen Years; since the Time I was Sixteen.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

You came from a School in Dublin that was under Mr. Carlile's Superintendence?
Yes; I came over to open that School from Scotland.

You say you have been engaged in Education for Fifteen Years; do you mean Fifteen Years from that Time, or from the Time you became connected with the National Board in 1833?
From the present Time.

When did you come from Scotland?
In the Year 1830.

You had been engaged in Education in Scotland up to 1830?
Yes.

Will you state how the Attendance of the Children is secured at the Schools?
I secured it in this Way. I take no Child into the Model School without the Parent or the Guardian coming with the Child. When the Parent comes I give Six Tickets, and if the Child is absent any Day he must bring a Ticket from the Parent to show that he has been absent; so that unless the Parent through Carelessness leaves the Ticket lying about the House the Child cannot get a Ticket, and cannot get in without a Ticket.

Have you found practically that by this Method the regular Attendance of the Children is pretty well secured?
They do not attend very regularly, but it is the Parents Fault if they do not.

What is the Number of Teachers that you have in training at this Time?
There were Thirty-nine came up; there have been Three or Four dismissed as incompetent.

What Number do you expect to be able to train at a Time when the Buildings are completed?
That will depend altogether upon the Number of Teachers.

How many do you calculate upon accommodating and instructing?
I think the Architect says the Rooms will hold 300 or 400; and of course we can train that Number if we have Teachers.

How many have you trained in the Establishment?
246.

When the Schools are attended by Clergymen of the Church of England, or the other Persuasions, for the Purpose of giving Religious Instruction to the Children, do you recommend to the Teachers, who are in the Course of training, to attend the Religious Instruction for the Purpose of qualifying themselves to give it in the Schools over which they are hereafter to be placed?
Certainly not; for we do not recommend the Teachers to give Religious Instruction at all.

Have you in point of fact attended on any Occasion for the Purpose of seeing the Mode in which Religious Instruction is given to the Children in the School?
No; the Masters attend the Clergymen, but it is not intended that they themselves should give Religious Instruction.

But they attend the Clergymen for the Purpose of receiving it?
Yes.

Do you always insist upon their attending the Clergyman, of whatever Persuasion they may be?
No, we do not insist upon it.

You take no Steps to enforce their Attendance upon any Species of Religious Worship during the Time they are under your Care?
No.

It would be contrary to the first Rules of your System, would it not, to require

A. M'Arthur, M.D

require either one of the Children or one of those Teachers to attend upon Religious Instruction?
Yes, it would.

But you give every Facility to it where they desire it?
We give every Facility for the Child or the Master attending Religious Instruction, and we adopt the same Plan of insuring Attendance upon Religious Instruction that we do upon the Instruction of every Day; that is to say, if a Child is absent upon the Day of Religious Instruction, he must bring a Ticket from his Parent to show that he has the Parent's Permission.

He is compelled to attend the School?
He is not compelled; the Parent can keep the Child at home, but we must know it is his Wish.

Then you compel them so far that they cannot absent themselves from Religious Instruction without the Leave of the Parent?
It is no Compulsion; the Parent has the Option.

But the Child has not the Choice?
The Child has not.

You have adopted that System as a Mode of preventing the Children from pretending that they have been at School and playing Truant?
Yes; we consider that they would obtain a Ticket of Absence, and if we did not take the Ticket they might keep it and play the Truant another Day.

You do not do it with a view to insist that they shall receive Religious Instruction, but you take it with the view of being certain that the Boy shall not make use of it on another Day?
Yes.

If a Boy presents a Ticket to show that he has come, is there any Compulsion to make him stay in the School when he is there?
We will not let them out after they have come; the Doors are locked after they are once in.

Have you any Means of knowing whether they feel themselves bound to learn when there?
I know nothing about that.

Had you ever any Complaint made to you by any Clergymen who have attended that they could not get them to learn?
I have never had that Complaint made to me. I had a Complaint that they did not attend regularly, but not that they did not learn; I know nothing about that.

Mr. Maturin has stated that he has represented to you, not only in the way of Complaint but of Regret, that the Boys did not learn when there; that he could not get them to learn by heart; do you now recollect that?
I do not recollect that; but I would have said to Mr. Maturin, if he had done so, that that was his Duty, not mine. I have no Control over the Children upon the Day of Religious Instruction.

Then that agrees with what Mr. Maturin represented; that you said it was a thing you could not help; that you had no Control over them?
I have no Control over that, but over their Attendance. I recollect Mr. Maturin saying that they did not regularly attend, but not the other.

When a Teacher is recommended to your School, do you make any Inquiry as to his Religious Creed. The Question refers to the Persons that come to be trained?
When we are to call up a Set, I generally go through the Inspector's Reports, and find if they have recommended any Teacher as likely to be improved by the training.

Are the Committee to understand that the School of which you are at the Head is only to train those Persons who are already Schoolmasters?
We have done nothing else, except in Two Cases.

A.M'Arthur, M.D.

The Building is not in a State to admit a great Number?
No.

Are there any Regulations prepared by the Board as to the Admission of Persons to be trained for becoming Teachers?
There have not been yet, because our Object is to find out what Material we have got in the Country for Teachers, and therefore we take up only those Teachers that are in Schools at present.

Do you mean to say that you have no Teachers under training at present that have not been already Teachers in Schools?
None.

And they are recommended by the Inspectors?
Not all. If the Inspectors say, in their Report of a School, that the Master is a fit Subject for training, we will take him up for certain; but there are never so many as to complete a Set, therefore we take all under the Age of Twenty-five that are fit for training; but I know nothing of their Religion, because that is not mentioned in the Report. The Inspectors never recommend so many as Forty or Fifty, so as to complete a Set for training; so, to make up the Number, I choose those under the Age of Twenty-five.

Suppose there are Accommodations for not more than Fifty Persons to be trained, and then suppose the Inspectors recommend Thirty Persons as fit Persons for training; you take those Thirty into the Set that are to be trained, and you also take Twenty more?
Yes.

How do you make your Selection?
I have no Means of making it, except by choosing those that I think of an Age fit for training; that is, under Twenty-five.

Where do you find those Persons?
I take them from the Inspectors Reports. If they say they are intelligent Men I generally choose those.

But you were understood to say that you first take all those recommended by the Inspectors?
I do. After that I choose those that I think, from the Inspectors Reports, are most capable of being trained. We are able from our Accommodations to take in but Fifty. Looking through the Inspectors Reports I find perhaps only Thirty recommended as fit Persons for training; to make up the other Twenty I myself select from the Inspectors Reports those that I think can be made something of, and they are called up.

If you are limited as to Room, it would seem that you would take those that are best fitted to be Schoolmasters to train them?
I find that all require training.

Your Object is to take those that are really effective?
Yes.

And that is best done by taking those whom the Inspectors find upon the whole to be the fittest for your training, from whatever Cause they may be induced to recommend them?
Yes.

What Qualifications induce you to make your Choice?
I should always like to have them under Twenty-five; under Twenty I should think better, if we commenced with them, and provided they are intelligent sensible Men.

Do you make any particular Inquiry as to their Religious Tenets?
I know nothing about that till they come up; then when I take their Names I ask whether they are Protestants or Roman Catholics.

When you find out whether they are Protestants or Roman Catholics what do you do with them in order to their Religious Instruction?
When the Day comes, which is Saturday generally, when the Clergymen attend, I tell the different Parties to go to the different Clergymen.

Do you find that they always go upon your telling them? *A. M'Arthur, M.D.*
At first they did not, but now they do; One or Two have been absent, but they generally go.

When you say at first they did not, during the Time before you came to Marlborough Street, when you were in St. Stephen's Parish, were they then in the habit generally of attending when you desired them?
The Roman Catholics did generally, I should think always, attend; the Protestants I think did not always.

Did they commonly?
As far as I can judge, I think they did.

Then, speaking broadly, what was the Proportion between the Protestants in Number, to the Roman Catholic Teachers who were brought up to be trained?
We have trained 246; thirty-one of those have been Protestants, and 215 Roman Catholics.

With regard to the Time before you came to Marlborough Street, have you any Document which will show the Number of Protestant Teachers who were trained when in St. Stephen's Parish, and the Number of Roman Catholics that were trained at that Time?
I think we have only had One Set up since we came to Marlborough Street.

What would that Set be; how many in Number?
Thirty-nine I think was the Number that came up.

That would reduce it to 207?
Yes.

Do you know in that Thirty-nine what was the Proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants?
I could not say distinctly; but we have Seven or Eight Protestants just now, and if that is deducted I think that leaves the Number.

How many Protestants have you altogether?
Thirty-one.

Then we may call it Twenty-four Protestants out of 207?
I think so.

They are put into the Hands of the Clergyman. Do you give any specific Orders to them what they are to do when they go to the Clergyman?
They are told that they may go to the Clergyman, but not ordered to do any thing.

Then you leave it to the Clergyman and them to settle what Mode shall be adopted when they are together?
Yes.

Have you any Reason to know whether much or little Religious Instruction was in fact communicated in the first place while they were under the Clergyman in Saint Stephen's Parish?
I never was in the Room during Religious Instruction. I might have been passing through it, but never remained in the Room.

Have the Masters ever themselves talked to you about the Quantum of Religious Instruction which they get there, and the Facility that is afforded to them?
Never.

You never recollect their speaking to you about their meeting with Facility or with Difficulty?
Never.

Have you ever conversed with the Protestant Clergyman upon that Subject?
I have had no Communication with any of the Protestant Clergymen upon that Subject, except at one Time that Mr. Woodward would not allow the Master to remain in the Room.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Was that Refusal subsequently withdrawn?
He never said so to me.

Had you ever any Communication from any other Person stating that Mr. Woodward had withdrawn that Objection?
Certainly not; never a Word about it.

In point of fact do you know whether, after that Refusal, training Teachers did attend when Mr. Woodward was giving Instruction?
I do not think so; but I do not know.

You are not aware of the Fact?
I am not aware of the Fact.

You have been a long Time engaged in Education, and for several Years in Scotland?
Yes.

In what Part of Scotland were you engaged in Education?
Principally near Edinburgh.

In what Sort of Schools?
I was engaged first in public at Bathgate, about Eighteen Miles from Edinburgh; it was a Parochial School, but not exactly so, because a Parishioner had left 16,000*l.*, I understand, to build an Academy in the Parish; and it was in this Academy that I was engaged. It was the Parochial School to which a Parishioner that died in the West Indies left a certain Sum for an Academy. In this Academy I was engaged. In Edinburgh I was engaged in the Circus Place School, which was a School founded for the Education of the higher Ranks, upon the Sessional School System.

Were you ever engaged in any School that was merely of the same Character as a Parochial School?
The first one I was in was merely of the same Character.

And this additional Endowment did not change the Nature of the Instruction?
Not at that Time, but it has since, because an Academy has been built.

What was the System that you found there; was it what was called the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland Schools?
They are not called so; they are called Parochial Schools.

What is the Principle of Instruction in those Schools?
The Plan of carrying on the School is left very much to the Teacher himself; there is no Interference from the Church of Scotland, except there be a Complaint of Immorality on the Part of the Teacher.

Is there any Demand on the Part of the Church of any one Species of Instruction to be given?
I do not know whether there is a Demand, but in all Schools the Bible is read and the Catechism of the Church of Scotland used.

Then the Principle in all those Schools is that the Bible be read in it every Day and the Catechism of the Church of Scotland used?
Every Day; but the Bible is merely read, not explained.

Were there any Roman Catholics in the Parish in which that School was held?
I never saw one at that Time.

In those Schools in which the Bible was not explained were there none but the Professors of the Religion of the Church of Scotland?
I do not know that there were only Professors of the Religion of the Church of Scotland, but there were no Roman Catholics.

Then upon what Principle was it that there was no Explanation of the Bible?
It was upon no Principle, but it was not the Custom. Now I believe the Bible is explained, since what is called the Intellectual System has been introduced into Scotland. Formerly it was not explained, because they never thought of explaining any Lesson.

Then

Then it was not in conformity with the Wish of any particular Sect or Religious Party in the Country that there was an Abstinence from Explanation?
Certainly not; it was merely the Master's Fault in not teaching it well.

Then you consider it to have been a Fault on the Part of the Teacher?
Certainly.

Are you acquainted with the Normal Schools in Edinburgh?
There are no Normal Schools that I am acquainted with in Edinburgh; there are the Sessional Schools.

Dr. M'Leod, the Moderator of the General Assembly, has said, that the Masters attend the Normal Schools?
There are no Normal Schools in Edinburgh; there are Schools that may be called Normal Schools. Dr. Thomson got up a School in his Parish, and Mr. Wood has the Sessional School. Those are both Sessional Schools, and Teachers that are intended for the Highlands frequently attend them, and that may give Occasion to their being called Normal Schools, but they are not so.

The following Statement has been made by Dr. M'Leod, the Moderator of the General Assembly: "Do you consider that though there is a Want of sufficient Instruction in Scotland the System itself is very deficient?—The System has been deficient, but the utmost Attention is now paid to training proper Teachers, and no Man is appointed to a School who has not a Diploma from the Normal Schools in Edinburgh or in Glasgow, and they are examined by Committees upon the different Branches." Perhaps you are not aware of that, as it may have been of recent Introduction?
I do not think there is any such Thing, if it is not the Sessional School which I have alluded to.

And again he is asked, "What Species of Examination do the Persons who come from the Normal Schools go through to obtain their Diplomas?—They attend the Normal Schools generally Three Months. They are examined before they are sent into the Normal Schools," and so on. Do you mean to say that you know of no Normal Schools except those which you have mentioned?
I know of none.

Do you know any thing of your own Knowledge of any Demands that are made in the Way of Qualification of Teachers in the Scotch Schools? Is there any Examination before they are appointed?
I know generally that in the Country Schools what are called the Heritors, the Landowners, who pay the Rate, always have the Candidates before them, and there is generally a Meeting of the Presbytery to examine the Candidates.

What do you call a Sessional School?
The Session of the Church of Scotland is composed of the Clergyman and the Elders, and this Session set up a School in the Parish; that is called a Sessional School.

The Session is something like a Vestry?
Yes.

How do you define a Normal School?
I look upon a Normal School as a School established by a certain Body, or by the Country, for training Masters. I do not look upon a Parish School as being a Normal School.

By Normal School you mean a Training School?
A Training School for that especial Purpose.

And by a Sessional School a Parish School?
A mere Parish School.

Do you understand that these Sessional Schools are Training Schools?
I understand that Mr. Wood's Sessional School has been used pretty largely for training; that is to say, those who are going to be Teachers attend it, but there is no Instruction given, except mere attending it, and seeing the Order in which the School is conducted.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Dr. M'Leod has said this, "that as the Masters attend the Normal Schools generally Three Months, they are examined before they are sent into the Normal Schools, to know what the Extent of their Knowledge is, and they are sent to the Normal Schools merely to learn the Art of teaching; but before they go to the Normal Schools they are examined by Committees of the General Assembly and Sub-Committees upon their Knowledge of the Gaelic Language, upon the reading of the English, upon English Grammar, and the ordinary Branches of Arithmetic;" were you aware of that?

I was not aware of that; it must have been since I left Edinburgh.

Are you aware that they are examined in those Schools before they are admitted to Diplomas enabling them to become Teachers in the Parochial Country Schools; that they are examined most minutely as to their Knowledge of the Scriptures?

I am not aware of that.

With respect to those Sessional Schools, what is the Practice of the Heritors, or the Persons who have to appoint the Teachers; is there any Examination of them?

I believe that in electing a Teacher for a Parochial School the Heritors and Clergymen of the Parish, if not, of the adjoining Parish, meet and examine the different Candidates. There is generally an Advertisement put in the Newspaper, and all who choose to forward Certificates meet, and are examined upon a certain Day.

Do you know what are the Subjects of Examination?

Their Knowledge generally in English Grammar, and Geography, and general Classics.

Is any Knowledge of Scripture required?

I cannot say whether there is.

Does it appear to you an adequate Mode of giving Religious Instruction to adult Teachers, that they should merely be present at the Instruction of Children, some of whom are as young as Five Years of Age, for an Hour in the Week?

I think that the Religious Impressions of such Individuals as enter upon the training are fixed before they come to the training. We seldom have any in training under Three or Four-and-twenty.

Then so far as regards giving Religious Instruction to those adult Teachers an Opportunity for that is not afforded, in your Opinion, by their Presence at the Instruction of the Children once a Week?

I look upon the Object of their being present to be mainly to see how the Thing is managed with us, that they may be able to manage it when they go to their own Schools.

Then you do not consider them as sent to the Clergyman in order to receive Religious Instruction, but to learn how to give Religious Instruction?

Partly.

But they have nothing to do with Religious Instruction in your Schools, have they?

No; but to see how it is to be managed; not to be themselves there to give Religious Instruction.

You understand them as going to the Clergyman, not to be taught their Religion, but merely to see the Clergyman teach the Children?

To learn as much as they can, though I do not think it is a very long Time to learn.

You were understood to say that they went there rather to learn how to manage the Thing?

I think it is of consequence for Teachers to know how we manage that in Dublin.

What is the Purpose for which you consider them to be sent to the Clergyman?

I consider that the Board mean them to receive Religious Instruction and to see how we manage the Religious Instruction in Dublin; how the Clergymen manage

manage with the Children, that they may know how to arrange in their own Schools.

Are they to be the Religious Instructors of their own Schools?
No; but they are to arrange the Manner of their going to the Clergy in their own Schools.

Then they go partly to learn what Religious Instruction they may pick up in that Way, but mainly to learn how to deal with the Matter in their own Schools hereafter?
I do not know mainly, but partly so, I think.

What do you consider the principal Object of sending them?
The principal Object, I think, is to get Religious Instruction, certainly.

The principal Object being to get Religious Instruction, do you think that that principal Object can be largely obtained by their being present at this Instruction One Hour or less in a Week, that Instruction being directed immediately, not to themselves, but to Children of from Five to Fifteen Years of Age?
I do not know whether it is directed principally to themselves, because I am not present at the Religious Instruction.

Should you think that much Religious Instruction is given to training Teachers, if that Religious Instruction is directed immediately to the Children who are from Five to Fifteen Years of Age?
I cannot say. The Course which is applicable to the Children may be applicable to the Masters, or it may not; I cannot judge of that.

Do you conceive that what is applicable to Children of Five Years old is applicable to Persons who have already fixed their Views of Religion?
It may or it may not. Some Things may be applicable to them, but as a whole it cannot be. If the Clergyman speaks so as to be understood by Children of Five Years old, of course it must be too simple for the further advanced.

You said that the Attendance upon the Religious Instruction of the Clergyman on the Part of the Training Teachers is merely voluntary?
Quite voluntary.

Is that a Reason why you would think that there is not much Chance of much Religious Instruction being given to them?
I do not think that would have any Influence upon the Effect of their Religious Instruction.

Do you conceive that it being left to the Option of those Training Teachers, either to attend or not to attend at the Time of Religious Instruction, is likely, or not, to have an Effect upon the Quantity of Religious Instruction which they will upon the whole carry away with them from the Schools?
I do not think it is likely.

Do you think that it being within the Option of the Teacher either to absent himself or not is not likely to make him derive less Religious Instruction than if he was compelled to be there every Day?
I think he is not likely to derive less, because I think that compelling him to be present would do no Good.

Have you any Reason to doubt that the young Men who are sent up to you for the Purpose of being trained in the Business of Schoolmasters have received Religious Instruction either from a Priest or a Protestant Clergyman according to their respective Professions?
I have no Doubt they have received Religious Instruction previously, but to what Extent I have no Means of ascertaining.

You do not consider that the Board is intrusted with the Duty of administering Religious Instruction to the People of Ireland, or to the Persons who are sent to them for training?
No, I do not.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Should you then object to a Person as not sufficiently trained who was of no Religion whatever?

I do not understand what is meant by "no Religion."

An Atheist?

I have not the Choice. The Board have the Choice of Teachers. Certainly they never had the Opportunity of selecting a Person who was stated in the Report to be an Atheist.

You ask them of what Religion they are when they arrive?

I never had an Example of any who told me that he was an Atheist.

What would be your Mode of acting in such a Case?

I have never thought of it, and till I meet with a Case I cannot say.

Should you not feel disposed to report it to the Board?

Certainly I would; but I could not act any Way myself.

Is not it one of the Duties of the Teacher to teach the Children to read the Scripture Extracts?

It is.

Should you think that a Master was competent to teach them to read the Scripture Extracts, to explain the Notes, and to give the necessary Explanation of those Extracts, who had had no Religious Instruction that you were acquainted with?

Certainly not; unless he had studied the Scripture Extracts.

When you send them from the Model School how do you know that they are qualified to teach the Children in the School to read the Extracts?

Because we read the Extracts with the Teachers whilst they are in training.

Do you give them any Explanations of those Extracts?

We explain any verbal Matters without entering upon the Doctrines.

Do you explain the Notes?

To the Masters; if they are historical, or Notes upon Natural History, of which there are a Number, we do explain them. If they are doctrinal Notes we read them.

If they are doctrinal Notes you do not give any Explanation?

No; but if a Word occurs that they do not understand, I explain it, taking Walker's Dictionary, or any Standard Work for the Purpose.

Do you give your Masters to understand that they are afterwards to make that Distinction themselves between the Notes which are historical and those which are doctrinal?

We give them to understand that they are to teach as they are taught.

Then in so doing you give them to understand that it is Part of their Duty to make that Distinction which you make?

Yes.

If that be so, why do not you explain that clearly and distinctly to them?

Because I do not feel it my Duty to enter upon any thing that I think doctrinal.

Do you recollect one of the Clergymen, Mr. Maturin, upon any Occasion, having complained to you of the irregular Attendance of the Training Teachers upon his Religious Instruction?

No.

He says, "On one Occasion I recollect having spoken to the Master of the School, and asked him why they were not regular in their Attendance; he mentioned to me upon that Occasion that they were receiving Instruction from some Literary or Scientific Lecturer as the Reason for their not attending?"

I do not recollect exactly the Circumstance, but I think I know to what he alludes. Mr. Maturin changed the Day from Saturday to Tuesday. Upon Tuesday he came from Three to Four, and the Masters had been engaged Six Hours in the School before that, and I dare say that they did not feel very willing to begin again.

A. McArthur, M.D.

You understand Mr. Maturin to have a great dea to do as Clergyman of the Parish, and that he could only come at the Time he could best spare?
Yes.

Did you understand whether any of his Parishioners were in the School?
I think there were some. If his Parish is the other Side of the Street, I know that there were.

Perhaps those Gentlemen may divide the Parish into Districts?
Perhaps so; I do not know.

In fact it was a Gift on his Part of his Time when there was no special Duty that called him there, and that would explain his not adhering to the same Hour, but taking the Time that was most convenient to him?
I do not know what his Reasons were.

Are you aware that the Board, in their Instructions to the Inspectors, speak of their Wish and Expectation that the Dublin Schools should be Models to all the Schools of the Country?
I do not know that they do so.

Are you aware that this System professes to be carrying into effect a Report of a Committee of the House of Commons of 1828?
I am.

A Part of that Report, towards the Conclusion, says this: "It has been the Object of your Committee to discover a Mode in which the combined Education of Protestant and Catholic may be carried on, resting on Religious Instruction, but free from the Suspicion of Proselytism." You see there that the Basis of Religious Instruction is contemplated by this Committee as essential in its Constitution?
I consider that the present Board does not take cognizance of the Religious Instruction at all, but that they allow every Denomination to take care of itself through the Clergyman.

Then you consider that the Board carries into effect the Object of this Committee, of a combined Education resting on Religious Instruction, by not taking cognizance itself at all of Religious Instruction, but leaving it to Individuals of the different Persuasions through the Clergy?
I think they afford Facilities, Schoolrooms, and Accommodation for the Clergy.

And that that answers the Object of the Committee as expressed there?
I do not know whether it answers it or not, but I think that is what is done.

That is all, as far as you know, that is done by the Board in effecting that Object?
I think so, if it is reckoned that the Scripture Extracts are not Religious Instruction.

Do you consider that the Scripture Extracts are Part of the Religious Instruction?
I think them a most valuable Part of the Religious Instruction.

Then do you think that Schoolmasters who have received no Religious Instruction from the Clergy but that which they may take voluntarily on their own Part are qualified for giving that Religious Instruction which you think is communicated by the Means of these Scripture Extracts?
I do not think so, because I think they have no Option in taking it when they were Children; before they got to the Age of Twenty they got Religious Instruction, whether they got it or not afterwards.

What Means do you take of ascertaining whether they have so acquired Religious Instruction before they come to your School?
We do not take any Means, except that we understand that Certificates of Moral Character are required from all Masters when they are elected Teachers.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

But you conceive that the Religious Instruction which a Master has had previously is sufficient to qualify him for giving Religious Instruction through the Scripture Extracts?

I think so; any Person that has a good Education is competent to explain the Scripture Extracts as far as we intend.

Do you mean a good Education independent of Religious Education?

I do.

Do you make that Answer from any Knowledge of the Way in which the Country People are brought up in Ireland, or do you judge of it from the Mode pursued in educating People in Scotland?

If the Master can examine well upon any Book whatever, he will be able to examine well upon the Scripture Extracts.

When you speak of a Person being competent to instruct the Children in the Scripture Extracts you speak of one whom you have practically exercised in it, and who has seen you and the other Masters teaching in it?

Certainly.

You do not trust to his previously acquired Knowledge?

I trust to nothing till I try myself.

Do you often find them already capable of teaching before they came to your School?

I find some, but not the Majority.

Have you any Doubt that a Child trained in reading the Scripture Extracts as they are read and taught in the School under your Superintendence is much better qualified to receive any additional Religious Instruction administered to him by the Clergyman of his own Persuasion than a Child who has not read such Extracts?

I have not the slightest Doubt of it.

Would he not attain that Instruction necessarily in a much smaller Amount of Time than a Child who had not been instructed by means of the Scripture Extracts?

He would.

Have you ever heard any Complaints from the Parents of Protestant or Catholic Children with regard to the Use of those Extracts?

None.

Have you ever been acquainted with the Existence of any Schools in which much less Religious Instruction than what is contained in those Extracts was the whole Religious Instruction that took place in the Schools?

I am confident that there are many Schools where the whole Bible is read where there is not nearly the same Amount of Religious Instruction given which may be given from those Extracts, if they are explained; not that I mean that it could not be given from the Bible, but that it is not given.

You are making the Comparison of a Case where there is mere Bible reading, without any Exertion of the Understanding in it, with a Case where there is an effective Instruction from the Scripture Extracts; you do not mean to say that in all Cases there is better Instruction given where the Extracts only are used, or that the Extracts are a better Mode of giving Religious Instruction than the reading of the Bible?

I think that more effective Instruction could be given from the Scriptures, if the Master was competent; but taking the Masters as they generally are, the parallel Passages being brought together in the Extracts, I think the Use of them is more efficient for the generality of Teachers that we have now in the Schools.

From your Knowledge of Schools where a great deal of Scriptural Knowledge is acquired, should you say that the Qualification for Teachers is the same?

I should say that when first I was engaged in teaching, and whilst I was a Boy at School, Religious Instruction was not given by explaining the reading from the Bible; but I am pretty certain that the Case has changed now, and that they do explain the Scripture.

Have

A. M'Arthur, M.D

Have you an Opinion whether, upon the whole, you think the giving a similar Quantity of Explanation, by competent Persons, from the Bible, or giving the Instruction from the Scripture Extracts, is to be preferred?

I think, if you have a Person who is perfectly qualified for it, the whole Scriptures are better; but with such Teachers as we have got, who are not competent, I conceive, to teach with the Bible, the Extracts, where the parallel Passages are brought together, are much better in their Hands.

You consider that in Ireland the Teachers are of a very inferior Grade?

I consider that they are inferior.

Now supposing that Plan to be carried into execution which has been recommended by the Board in their Second Report, and that the Grade of Teachers in every respect were raised, do you think it will be an equally good Mode to give Religious Instruction from the Scripture Extracts as from the Bible?

I cannot say.

Are the Committee to understand that you think that, under the present Circumstances, or under any Circumstances, it is better to teach the Children from those Extracts than to teach them from the whole Bible?

I think it is, under the present Circumstances; and I am much afraid that no training would get the whole Class of Teachers to teach equally well from the Bible.

Do they teach as well from the Bible as they would be able to teach from the Extracts?

When the parallel Passages are brought from the Old and New Testament together, I think many are competent to teach efficiently, Men who could not for themselves bring the parallel Passages together.

Are you aware that it is a common Mode of printing the Bible with reference to the parallel Passages?

Yes; but I do not think there is Time to attend to those References in Schools to any Extent.

Have you ever seen any Operations of the Hibernian School Society in Ireland?

No.

Or the Kildare Place Society?

I have seen some of the Schools of the Kildare Place Society.

Do you think the Masters whom you have seen under the Kildare Place Establishment are more competent to teach the Bible than those trained in your School?

I could not judge of that. I have once or twice had Masters in training that have been previously in the Kildare Place School, but I did not see any marked Difference, except in their Manner of arranging the Classes in the Schools; they certainly understand that better.

You have stated that the Schoolmasters sent to you are of such low Capacity now that they are incapable of teaching from the Bible. Do many of them come to you without any Knowledge of the Scripture Extracts?

I do not know that they are incapable of teaching from the Bible; but I mean to say that they will teach better from the Extracts.

Are those that come to you acquainted with those Scripture Extracts before they come?

Some of them are from having been reading them with their Pupils.

Are they generally?

I should say they are generally, but it depends on their being in the last Classes; the first ones were not, because they had not had them.

Have there been many Cases in which they have not been acquainted with them?

I do not recollect above One or Two Instances in which I have found them ignorant of the Extracts, but I do not recollect an Instance in which they were ignorant of the Facts in the Extracts.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Are the Training Teachers under Control at all when they are not in your Schools. Have you any Superintendence over them in the Town?
Not much. I required them to be in their Lodgings at Nine o'Clock; I found there were One or Two Breaches of that Rule, and now I require them to be in at Eight o'Clock.

Of those that attend the School is a List made of where they lodge?
Yes.

Is there a frequent Visitation of their Lodgings to ascertain whether they are in?
Now and then the Porters are sent to ascertain whether they are present at their Lodgings.

So that the Superintendence is exercised by the Porter?
Not at all; because if they report a Case, and I think there is any Deception, I visit myself.

Has that often occurred?
Only twice.

How far are their Lodgings from your Residence?
They are scattered over Four or Five Houses; they generally lodge Half a Dozen together.

In different Parts of Dublin?
Yes.

May they lodge anywhere they please?
Yes.

They have 12*s.* a Week allowed?
Yes.

That will afford, in many Instances, only the Means of extremely mean Lodgings?
Not very good Lodgings.

Did you ever hear that any of them lodged in Cellars?
I never did, and I do not think it.

Do you pay the Money to themselves to find the Lodgings, or do you pay the Bills of the Persons at whose Houses they lodge?
We give the Money to themselves; but I am aware that it is intended to change that Mode of lodging.

Would you not fix upon a certain Number of Houses where they might all lodge?
It is intended to do so, or to get Lodgings.

Do you understand that the Porters go every Night to ascertain whether they are in?
No, I do not think it is necessary.

It has only twice happened to you in the course of Four Years yourself to have Occasion to go to ascertain whether they were in?
Only to ascertain in case of Suspicion of Deception. I have gone sometimes to visit them where they were unwell.

You have only gone twice to ascertain the Point of their being in their Lodgings, without Reference to visiting them as sick?
Yes, because I had no Reason to suspect. When I find them regular in their Attendance at the Time, I think every thing is going on well; but if I find them absent in the Morning — for they are to be with us at Seven in the Morning — I suspect there is something wrong.

In those Two Cases where you suspected something was wrong, did you find any thing was wrong?
I found that one who reported himself as sick was absent; he said he had gone out to take an Airing.

Was there any Deception in the other Case?
No, there was not.

Has it happened that any have been punished for Immorality during your Residence in Dublin?
There was one who came up for training, and after he had been some Weeks in the Training School a Letter came from the Country mentioning that he had been guilty of Immorality, and he confessed the Crime, and we turned him off.

That was not found by yourself?
No; it was in the Country that the Crime was committed.

The Question is, whether any have been punished for Immorality in Dublin?
Yes; I recollect one that was turned off because he had been found drinking at one Time; that is the only Case that I recollect.

Are you aware that the Board in its Instructions to the Inspectors says that they are anxious that all the Schools in Dublin and its Vicinity shall be Model Schools for all Ireland?
Yes, I believe there is something of that Kind.

The Instructions state, that "When the Inspectors are in Dublin they will be expected to attend the Model School, or any other School that may be pointed out to them, for the Purpose of making themselves perfectly acquainted with the System of teaching pursued by the Head Master, and also of aiding or introducing Improvements in Schools in the Metropolis, as the Commissioners are anxious that all Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity may be such as will fit them for becoming Model Schools for the rest of the Kingdom." Do you know whether in point of fact the Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity have answered this Object of the Board?
Certainly not; I think our Schools in and about Dublin are among our worst Schools, as far as I have seen.

Have you visited many of the Board Schools in Dublin?
A considerable Number of them in and about Dublin.

Can you mention any?
I have visited the Mill Street Schools; I have visited Dundrum, Chapel Lizzard, Lower Roads, King's Inn Street Female School, Gloucester Place, Black Rock Female School, Dalkey, Howth, and the Richmond Street.

Is that Richmond Street School called by any other Name?
They call it a Model School, I understand.

When you say they call it a Model School, who do you mean by "they"?
I mean the Christian Brothers.

The Christian Brothers are the Managers of that School?
Yes; at least they are some Brothers of some Order.

In point of fact, is "Model School" inscribed over the School?
I believe it is; it was when I saw it; it is a Couple of Years since I saw it.

Besides the Inscription of "Model School," was "National School" also upon it?
I do not recollect.

If "National School" was not up before it will not the Rules of the Board be violated?
Certainly.

It ought to have been there?
Yes.

Should not you have been struck if that had not been there?
I was not inspecting it when I went to it, so that I did not take such particular Notice.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

But "Model School" being put up there, and this being a National School, would it not be naturally supposed that that was a National Model School?
Perhaps it would.

Does this Richmond Street School bear any third Name that you ever heard of?
Not that I am aware of.

Did you ever know that in Dublin it had been called sometimes the "O'Connell School"?
I never heard so.

Did you ever know that that School was built by a Subscription of the Catholic Association?
I understood so; I understood that "Model School" was put up at that Time.

And it is not taken down since it has been a National School?
Not that I am aware of.

It has been for some Years a National School?
It has been for some Years, but I do not know exactly how long.

Are you aware that there was a great Procession at the laying of the First Stone?
I do not suppose that I was in Dublin at that Time.

Which of the Schools you have mentioned are the Schools your Experience of which made you say that you considered the Dublin Schools as among the worst?
Not the whole, but some of them.

Mill Street School; what Sort of a School is that?
I think that a good one.

Where is that?
That is in the Liberty.

Dundrum; is that in Dublin?
It is about Two or Three Miles from it.

Is that a good one?
It is a tolerably good one.

Chapel Lizzard?
That is tolerable too.

Lower Roads?
Lower Roads I think bad.

King's Inn Street Female School?
That was a very good one under the last Mistress; but I do not think it so good under the present Mistress.

When did the Change take place?
She died, I think, about Half a Year or a Year ago.

Gloucester Place?
That is pretty good.

Black Rock?
That is good.

Dalkey?
That is very good.

Howth?
That is very good, and there is a bad one about a Mile from Howth; about a Mile and a Half before you come to Howth.

The Richmond Street School; is that a good one?
The Order and Regularity and Discipline about it, I think very good; but I cannot speak so much of the intellectual Part of it, because I did not examine it as Inspector.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

You say that the Schools in and about Dublin are among the worst; and yet when we come to inquire into the Particulars there is only one you call a bad one?

But there are others, if I recollected the Names; and when I speak of the Schools in Ireland, I speak comparatively, because there are very few indeed which I think are Schools such as ought to be; but in what I said I spoke comparatively.

You say that the Schools about Dublin are among the worst?
So they are; there are several that have not been mentioned.

But when you come to Particulars there is only one that you call bad; perhaps you can recollect the others?
There is one at St. Catherine's, that is a very bad one.

Any other?
Yes.

What think you of St. Andrew's?
St. Andrew's I do not think very good. There is one in the Artillery Barracks, that is tolerably good, and there is one above the Artillery Barracks that is very bad, and which we struck off.

Your general Impression being, that the Schools in and about Dublin are worse than the Schools in general, you have given a List and their Character, and out of Fourteen there are only Two that are bad?
I must be understood to speak comparatively of the Dublin Schools. I do not think we have one decidedly good School except the Mill Street.

You mean that you have one Standard, and from that you form your Estimate with respect to the Dublin Schools, and with respect to the Schools generally throughout the Country?
I take Mill Street School as the Standard at present; I think that the best we have.

Are those which are comparatively good positively bad?
I think they are most of them bad.

Are the Committee to understand that while you describe one as good which you consider the Standard, and you talk of another as tolerable, and another as tolerable, and so on, and another good, and Two others very good, that they are all with reference to this Standard School, the Mill Street School?
I consider Mill Street as the best we have got, and perhaps the next best in Arrangement and Regularity is the Dalkey, that I have seen. One School is good in one Thing and bad in another; one gives intellectual Information but it has not the Arrangements, and another has the Arrangements good but does not give intellectual Information.

You have said that the Dublin Schools are the worst in the Country; then if so, why do you call them generally good, very good, and tolerable?
In reference to the Dublin Schools themselves.

Then this is to be considered as their Character only as compared among themselves; but as compared with the Country Schools they are not to be taken so?
As compared with the Country Schools I think them as a whole worse than what I have seen; but I have not seen many Country Schools.

Then, without having seen many Country Schools, you think you are at liberty to say that the Dublin Schools are amongst the worst you have under the Board?
Among the worst I have seen.

How many Country Schools have you seen?
I have seen Thirty or Forty.

Have you ever seen the Schools in the County of Carlow?
I have seen one of the Schools in Carlow; I have seen both the Male and Female School.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Are they good?
They are both the best that I saw in the Country.

Then as compared with the Dublin Schools they must have been capital?
They were much better than any, except the Mill Street School.

Were you at the Tullow School?
I was.

What Sort of School is that?
When I am speaking of these Schools I would desire to mention that it was the very first Year we commenced. One of the Inspectors being unable to go out, I took his Place, and was out for a Fortnight or Three Weeks, so that it was at the very Commencement of our System, and before they had got under us as it were. Tullow School I did not examine then; I merely saw it, and every thing appeared regular.

Was there any particular Reason which induced you to visit those Schools in the County of Carlow?
I merely took the Book of an Inspector who was unwell.

In what Year was this?
It was the very first Year the Board commenced. 1832, I think it was, or the Spring of 1833.

At that Time who were the Teachers in the Tullow Schools; were they Monks and Nuns?
I believe not Monks, that I remarked; but they were Nuns. I do not think there was a Lay Brother or a Monk in them.

At that Time did any Protestants attend?
I did not inquire.

Have you been often sent into the Country to make special Inspections of Schools?
Not often.

How often?
I have been out once or twice.

What special Reasons were there for your going?
The first was that the Inspector was unwell, and unable to go out; the Model School was not open then; and the second Time one Inspector had resigned before another was appointed, and as there were no Masters up I went out for a few Days.

In what Year was that second Visit made?
It was towards the End of the last Year.

To what County did you then go inspecting?
I went North; but I was only out for Two or Three Days.

What Schools did you see?
I do not recollect the Names; it was in the County of Down, on the West Side.

Do you recollect the Towns that you went to?
I went to Downpatrick; but I saw nothing there, because it was a very bad Day, and the School there was shut up when I went.

Then it is from your Experience of those Two Visitings of Schools in the Country, namely, that Visit in 1832 or the Spring of 1833, and in this Visit of Two or Three Days at the End of last Year, that you saw enough of the Schools in the Country to be able to say that they are vastly superior to those in Dublin generally?
I beg to say that I recollect another Time that I was round by Carrickfergus, and saw several Schools then; that was between the Two Times; and I saw some of the Schools round Belfast.

Then you have been chiefly employed in inspecting in Ulster?
I do not remember whether I was a longer Time in Ulster than the Time I was in Carlow.

A. M'Arthur, M.D

Then Carlow is the only Part of Ireland in which you have inspected Schools, except Ulster?
Yes, and Part of the County of Tipperary.

What Schools in Tipperary did you examine?
I do not recollect.

What Towns did you go to?
I was at Clonmel, but I did not inspect the School; but there was a School Three or Four Miles distant.

What School was that?
I do not recollect.

Your Experience altogether made you think that the Dublin Schools were worse than the Country Schools?
Yes; I did not attend particularly, because I was merely acting for the Time being as Inspector.

What Schools have you been at upon your Visit to the County of Down; did you visit the School at Ross Trevor in the County of Down?
I do not remember.

Did you visit the School in the Town of Newry?
No; I do not recollect being at Newry at all. I visited no School in Newry.

Have you in Dublin ever visited St. Peter's School situated under the Roman Catholic Chapel in North Circular Street, Dublin?
I have. That School is struck off.

When?
I do not know the Date.

Since the last Report?
I do not know; those are Things that do not come under my Cognizance.

What Reason have you to believe that it is struck off?
I heard so in the Office.

When did you hear that?
I do not recollect; I did not attend to it.

Do you know the Tallat School?
Yes; I visited it once, and gave such a Report that the Master was turned away.

Were you ever in the Kingstown School?
Yes, I was once.

Is that a good School?
No; I think it a very bad one.

You went to a School that is under the Roman Catholic Chapel; being under the Roman Catholic Chapel it forms of course Part of the Building of which the Chapel is a material Part?
I did.

Did you inquire whether any Protestant Children went there?
No, I did not make such Inquiries.

You were not prevented from making Inquiry by considering it an unfit Inquiry?
I understood that the Inspectors did not do so formerly.

Are you aware that recent Orders called on them to do so?
I have not been inspecting since; I do not know it; I understood that it was done.

You understood that it was the Duty of the Inspectors, but you did not know that they had received Instructions to do so?
No.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

You are in the habit of teaching the Inspectors how to inspect, in fact?
Not exactly teaching them how to inspect, but showing them how we teach in the Model School.

For the Purpose of enabling them to carry on their Inspection more efficiently?
Yes.

Do they regularly attend for that Purpose when in Dublin?
No; when they are in Dublin they look into the School now and then.

How many Inspectors are there?
Eight.

They are employed inspecting about Nine Months in the Year?
I believe so, but that I have nothing to do with.

You know them all of course, individually?
Yes, certainly.

You can tell whether each Individual comes so often as to make it likely that he was resident Three Months in Dublin in the course of a Year?
I cannot say that.

The Instructions say, "When Inspectors are in Dublin they will be expected to attend the Model School, or any other School that may be pointed out to them, for the Purpose of making themselves perfectly acquainted with the System of teaching pursued by the Head Master, and also of aiding or introducing Improvements into Schools in the Metropolis, as the Commissioners are anxious that all Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity may be such as will fit them for becoming Model Schools for the rest of the Kingdom. They are directed to pay particular Attention to the Instructions and Suggestions of the Head Master." In point of fact, have they made themselves perfectly acquainted with the System of teaching pursued by you?
I do not know; the System is going on every Day, and I see one stepping in now and then, and another coming occasionally; but certainly there is no regular Attendance, nor do I think it necessary.

Did you ever give any Instruction or Suggestion to any of them?
I have.

Have you found that they paid particular Attention to the Instructions or Suggestions you gave to them?
That I do not know.

About what Portion of the Time are you usually in the School itself, where the Boys and Girls are?
Sometimes more and sometimes less. Sometimes Visitors call, and I accompany them to different Parts; I am about it the whole Day.

The Training Teachers are with you for Three Months?
They are.

What is your usual Course for the Purpose of instructing them?
We take them through the Books published by the Board, and see that they fully understand them, and that they understand all the Words, and can point out in the Map the different Places mentioned; and that they understand the different Productions, and where they come from; and they go as far as they can in Mathematics and English Grammar; there is a Mathematical Master and a Master for English, and they go through with myself all the English Books, including the Five Reading Books and the Extracts.

Do you find that Three Months is sufficiently long to enable them to have learnt their Business well as Teachers?
Certainly not.

Then you are obliged to let them go without being satisfied of their Efficiency?
Certainly.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Have you got a specific Plan that you adopt, or do you give your Instructions as Circumstances arise; have you a specific Course?
The specific Course is going regularly on through the Books in a certain Order; but Regularity in Instruction cannot be followed, because you do not know what they most require to be taught till you begin with them.

It depends upon their previous Acquirements?
Certainly.

Do you teach them particularly how to teach; is that a main Part of the Instruction?
It is; so that I sometimes require them to get up and teach the Masters before me.

Is there any Objection to continue them under the Instruction longer than Three Months?
I am not aware of any, except the Want of Funds.

There has never been an Application to continue a Master longer than that Period?
Not that I know of.

If there have been such Applications they have not been attended to?
No.

Shall you have the Means of keeping them a longer Time when the new Arrangements are completed?
I think it is intended to do so.

Will you have the Means of doing so?
I do not know what the Means are, except larger Funds.

The Question refers to the increased Size of the Buildings.
Yes.

Will the Patrons be obliged to contribute any Part of the Expense?
I do not know what the Intentions of the Board are in that respect; they do not do so now.

You stated that the Religious Opinions of the Teachers that came in were fixed before they came to the Model School?
I suppose so.

Have any Persons come in to be taught that were previously engaged in Monkish Establishments?
I believe there were One or Two Instances.

They were taught under you with a view to return to Schools carried on under Monkish Establishments?
I believe so.

Do the Monkish Schools in Mill Street and Hanover Street train School-masters?
I believe not; at least I never heard of any; never in Mill Street; I do not know what Hanover Street is.

In Richmond Street they do?
In Richmond Street I have heard of it.

Do you know whether any that have been trained in the Richmond Street School have been trained again in yours?
Not that I know of.

Have any Female Teachers been trained in your Model School?
We have had none yet.

Are they trained elsewhere?
No.

Have any Female Teachers in your Schools been trained in the Nunnery in Gardiner Street?
Not that I know of.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Do you know that there is a Nunnery in Gardiner Street?
I do not know.

Do you know why you do not train Female Teachers?
Because we have not Accommodation.

Neither have you Accommodation for Male Teachers?
Not the Accommodation that we want, but we have Accommodation, so far as Rooms for teaching in, to a certain Extent.

Have you not the Power of teaching Females in that Way also; have you no Rooms where you can receive Females to train?
We have none connected with the Building, and we never have had.

Is not it intended to have training Apartments for Females?
I do not know whether that is intended. Indeed I believe the Commissioners thought it would be better that they should teach only Sewing and Needlework; that Male Teachers should teach the Females.

Have you ever had any Application from the Children that attend your Schools or from their Parents for Leave to read the Scriptures?
Never.

You are well acquainted with the Statement which the Board has given in their Second Report of the Manner in which they think the System can be extended?
I am.

It is your Duty to have the Superintendence over the Training Teachers out of the School?
So far as I mentioned before.

How far is that?
That I send the Porters now and then to see that they are in their Lodgings, and that I hold myself in readiness to go myself if I think that they use Deception with the Porters.

One of the Commissioners, the Rev. James Carlile, has said, "We keep a regular Inspection over the Masters who are brought up; they are visited at the Places where they lodge, and kept correct and orderly." Now, supposing there were 2,000 Training Teachers at once in Dublin, should you be able to conduct that satisfactorily?
I do not think I could; and I do not think the Commissioners contemplate the present System at all when we have got more.

Do you know what Course is intended?
I do not think that any particular Course is fixed upon.

Was it determined that there should be a Course adopted which should be sufficient to superintend them?
I understood that the Foundling Hospital was applied for to lodge the Masters there, where they could be under Superintendence.

Do you know that?
I understood that it was applied for.

From whom did you understand it?
I think Mr. Blake mentioned it to me.

Are you aware that there is not the slightest Intimation, in the Second Report of the Commissioners which you have had placed in your Hand, of any other Mode being adopted for the sake of the Superintendence of the Training Teachers than that which has now been referred to?
I am not aware whether it is in the Report or not.

Will you look through any One of the Years and see whether there is any Article there which appears to be capable of providing for that Particular?
Unless the Item for training provides for it, I do not see any; but I think that Item would do it, because I think it would be done at less Expense than at present.

When

When you had 2,000 how could that be done?
If we were to allow 2,000 12*s.* a Week I think we could provide an Establishment for them to be under complete Superintendence at less Money.

You think that there could be a sufficient Superintendence?
Yes.

There would be only one Training School in Dublin still?
I do not know what is meant by one "Training School;" there may be many Rooms in a Training School.

For 2,000 of course there must be a much larger Establishment than what you have at present?
Certainly.

The Buildings must be much larger, must not they?
There are Four Rooms at present that I believe are capable of holding 200 or 300.

But you think that there could be an efficient Superintendence of 2,000 if they had 12*s.* a Week in the School, according to the present System?
I think so.

In order to that should you think it necessary that a special Building must be provided to hold them all?
Either a special Building or special Buildings.

And you think then that with 12*s.* a Week allowed for each Individual that would enable you to have an efficient Superintendence?
I think so.

Are the 12*s.* a Week intended solely for Lodging?
It is all that they get for Lodging and Board.

Are they expected to lodge and board themselves for that?
They are.

You consider that they are enabled by that Means to provide themselves with tolerable Board and Lodging?
They do so; not very good.

Have you been acquainted with any Instances in which they have been in any way deteriorated or corrupted by their Residence in Dublin?
No such Instances have come to my Knowledge.

Upon the whole, have you had Reason to find them well-conducted Persons?
As far as I know.

And desirous of availing themselves of the Instruction which they were sent to procure?
Yes. There may be One or Two Instances where they are indolent; but generally they have been desirous of availing themselves of the Means of Instruction.

Are the Schools provided with Maps for the Purpose of illustrating the Instruction you give?
Yes; the Commissioners have had Maps engraved on purpose, with the physical Features strongly marked.

Do you find the Maps particularly useful in conveying and enforcing Instruction?
Very useful.

Upon the whole, have the Parents of the Children, both Protestant and Catholic, intrusted to your Care, as far as you have had occasion to know, been satisfied with the Instruction that their Children have received?
They have seemed to be perfectly satisfied, so that we could have had many Times more Children than we have been able to admit. They come from a Distance of even Three Miles sometimes to School.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

Are you acquainted with any Roman Catholic Children that have been withheld from attending the School, either by the Influence of the Priests or in any other Manner, in consequence of a Dislike of the System of Education?

I know of none.

You have no Doubt then of the System applying to the general Instruction of the Mass of Roman Catholic Children, so far as the Means of the Commissioners will enable them to apply it?

I nave no Doubt of its being applied to the Roman Catholics.

Have you ever inspected the Model School of the Kildare Place Society?

I have been in it once or twice.

Have you any Reason to think that there was any better System of Education given there than in your Model School?

I have Reason to think that the Children did not get so much Religious Instruction there as we give. The first Week I was in Dublin I went to Kildare Street, and one Girl stood up at the End of the Day and read a Chapter, and I did not understand what the Girl said, and I am certain the Children did not; and that was the whole of the Religious Instruction.

What Year was that in?

It was in the Year 1830, I think.

Did you ever go there a second Time?

I did.

Did you find the same Fault?

It was not at the Time when the Religious Instruction was given that I was there the second Time.

Did you make the Remark to the Conductor of the School?

No.

What Age was the Child?

It was a Child that read tolerably well, but I did not understand the Child, and no Child perhaps could be understood over such a Room; she read that Chapter, which was the sole Religious Instruction for the Day for the whole School.

Have you any Reason to think that the Moral and Literary Education in the Model School of the Kildare Place Society was of a higher Order than that in your Model School?

I do not think it was of a higher Order; I do not think the intellectual Powers of the Individual were exercised to the same Degree.

Then your Impression is, that the Education of every Kind in your Model School is better than in the Model School of the Kildare Place Society?

I think the intellectual is. I think they have got to a much greater Extent the mechanical Part of keeping the School in order than we have yet attained to.

You think the Scriptural Instruction is better in your School?

I have not the slightest Doubt of it.

Have not you been hitherto impeded in the mechanical Part by the Insufficiency in the local Arrangements provided for your School?

Certainly we have; we have been divided into Three Rooms, and we have to show a Model of a School in one Room.

Have you any Doubt that with the improved Accommodation and local Arrangements now in the course of being provided you may attain the same Perfection in the mechanical Part?

No Doubt.

Your Experience of the Kildare Street Model School is derived from your Visit in 1830; have you been there since?

I have; in the Year that we began.

Did you make the same Observation then in that Year?
I mentioned before that I did not hear the Religious Instruction upon that Occasion.

A. M'Arthur, M.D.

So that you have no Means of knowing, with respect to the Religious Instruction, since 1830?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 11° *Aprilis* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

John Price, Esq.

JOHN PRICE Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Magistrate of the Queen's County?
I am.

You are also Agent for my Lord Lansdowne and for the Ladies Fitzpatrick?
Yes, and for the Honourable Mrs. Warnford.

Is there any National School on any Part of my Lord Lansdowne's Property in the Queen's County?
Yes; one at Shangannaghmore.

Has there been?
There never was a National School on Lord Lansdowne's Property, except at Shangannaghmore.

Is Lord Lansdowne's Property near Erril?
It is Eighteen or Twenty Miles distant from it.

In a different Part of the County?
Yes; one is joining the County of Tipperary, and the other contiguous to the County of Kildare.

Then Erril also is under your Management?
Yes.

Had you Occasion about the Year 1834 to make any Change in the letting of the Erril Townland?
Yes; Three Years ago, in 1834, the Lease expired by the Death of the last surviving Life.

What was the Nature of the Change that you made?
Diminishing the Population and dividing the Farms, squaring them into Twenty and Thirty and Fifty Acre Farms, and removing a considerable Portion of Persons who were refractory, and refused me Possession, in point of fact.

Did not that cause a good deal of Dissatisfaction among the People of Erril?
There was a considerable Excitement in the County all through at that Moment.

At that Moment the County in general was in a disturbed State?
Yes; it had been disturbed from and previous to the Time of the Commission in 1832, and I may say continued so till 1835.

In an equal Degree disturbed in 1835?
Certainly not, but it was more or less disturbed.

Is the Country about Erril distinguished for being more peaceable than the rest of the Country?
I should say that it was not distinguished for being particularly peaceable.

Did Ribbonism prevail at all, as far as you have Reason to believe?
Ribbonism was not the Crime prevalent through that County; it was carried on under a different Name; Whitefeet and Blackfeet were the distinguished Disturbers of the Peace of that County. Though they were Two opposed Parties, yet they acted both for a bad and criminal Purpose.

John Price, Esq.

On this particular Occasion, when you made this Change in the letting of Erril, did the People manifest their Feeling in any particular Way?

They showed me their Discountenance, as they usually do in such Cases to Men doing an ungracious but a necessary Act. I did not bring in new Tenants, but I removed some of the People that I found there. They manifested their Feeling in this Way: they put up a Gander as an Effigy of me, with an Inscription underneath threatening me if I persevered in the Line of Conduct I was pursuing.

This was a threatening Notice under the Figure of a real dead Goose?
Yes; I saw the threatening Notice in the Hands of Police.

What was the Inscription?
It was a threatening Notice.

Threatening what?
To prepare my Coffin, and warning me to take care not to turn off the old Residenters.

Was that threatening Notice sent to you?
No, it was not. I was destroying the old Fences on this Farm; I had a Number of People destroying the old Fences and making new Fences, and on one of those new Fences a Pole was stuck up with this Goose, and this Inscription affixed to it.

Had you any Reason to suspect any particular Person as engaged in it?
I had no Reason at the Time myself. The Notice was written on National Education Paper, and that led to the Supposition that it came out of the Erril National School.

Is there a National School at Erril?
There was.

Is there now?
I think not; it has been discontinued.

In what Way?
By a Letter received by me from the Board.

How long ago?
The last Letter I received was in February 1837.

The February of this Year?
Yes; it had been discontinued before.

Were you originally its Patron?
I was one; I was the original Promoter of it, acting under the Ladies Fitzpatrick.

Did you hold the Office of Patron under the Board?
Yes, in conjunction with the Rev. Mr. Treacy.

Did you, either on your own Account or on account of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, give the Master any Sum of Money?
Yes; we paid him on account of the Ladies Fitzpatrick so much a Year, and he was allowed the Garden and House Rent-free. The School was built partly at the Expense of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, and partly at the Expense of the Lord Lieutenant's Fund.

Had you continued to pay that Allowance up to the Period that the School ceased?
I have discontinued paying that Schoolmaster from the latter End of 1835, or from January 1836.

Did you correspond with the Board for this School?
I was the Correspondent originally; I brought it under the National Board as a School; I placed it under the London Hibernian Society first in 1823; that was discontinued; I then placed it under the Kildare Place Society in 1826, and that was also discontinued in 1830.

When did you come under the National Board?
In the Year 1832 or 1833.

319

John Price, Esq.

And you and Mr. Treacy applied for it jointly at that Time?
We applied jointly at that Time.

Was he the Rector of the Parish?
He is the Catholic Rector.

Up to what Period were you Correspondent with the Board for this School?
I cannot say that I was altogether the Correspondent. I have received Letters from the Board once or twice in the Year, to say that the Salary was forthcoming, or to ask why I did not require it, and so forth. Latterly I have received other Letters relative to that School, since its Management was condemned and the Master disapproved of.

When was it condemned?
It was disapproved of in the latter End of 1835.

By whom?
By the Board and by myself.

And you have ceased to correspond with the Board since that Time?
Certainly not.

Upon the Subject of that School?
No, certainly; I have had more Correspondence perhaps with the Board, both personally and by Letter, since.

The School, however, has long ceased to be under your Patronage?
It has not ceased. I have been endeavouring to place it under a better Master, though the former Master is there still.

When did you try to get rid of this Master?
I have been for the last Year trying to get rid of him.

Since the Beginning of 1836?
Yes.

Have you often visited this School since 1836?
No; I did not recognize it as a School belonging to the Ladies Fitzpatrick since I discontinued paying the Master.

And you have not gone to the Schoolhouse since that Time?
I have gone to the Door to see the Master, to ask him when he would give me up the Possession of it.

What is the Name of the Master of the School?
William White.

Why did you wish to get rid of him?
Because of his Incompetency.

His literary Incompetency?
Yes; and the Statement that was sent to me by the Board, censuring me for continuing such an incompetent Man in the School.

What was his general Moral Character?
His general Character I had a favourable Opinion of, as will be manifest when I say that I found him first in a Hedge School, and supplied him with Books there which I procured from the London Hibernian Society. He maintained an excellent Moral Character then, but an incompetent Man nevertheless; I then sent him to be trained in the Kildare Place Model School, from whence he got his Certificate of good Conduct and Qualification. The Schoolhouse at Erril was then built, mostly at the Expense of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, and partly from the Lord Lieutenant's Fund; he was placed in that School; he continued under the Kildare Place Society, with their perfect Approval and with my perfect Approval, till the School was abandoned, and converted into a Police Station during the Years 1830, 1831, and 1832. About this Period the National Board was established, and I called on the Priest, Mr. Treacy, the Children being all Catholic who attend the School, to consult him, and we both agreed to forward a Memorial to the Board to take this School into their Connexion, which they immediately did. I knew that he was not exactly the Master that I would have approved, but in Ireland it is a very difficult Thing to get competent Masters.

John Price, Esq.

The Question is, what is his general Moral Character?
His general Moral Character I have a good Opinion of.

What is his general Moral Character at the present Moment?
His general Moral Character now is lessened by his Disposition to drink.

Is that the worst Part of his Character?
Yes.

What Opinion, from your own Experience, have you formed of his Moral Character?
That he was an incompetent Man, but an harmless Character, and disposed to tipple.

That is, a loyal and peaceable Subject?
A loyal and peaceable Subject he appeared to me to be; as for any overt Acts, I did not observe or hear of any.

Did you ever give a different Account of your Opinion of this Man's Character to any one whatever?
I do not recollect that I did. At the Time of the Excitement at Erril his Brothers were some of those Persons that were turned out, and the Notice that was written on the National School Paper, and his near Connexion with them, led me to look upon him with a great deal of Suspicion; but the Ground of my Suspicion was merely this Connexion with his Brothers, and the Fact of the Notice being written on a National School Paper, and his immediate Contiguity to the Place where my Conduct was unpopular, at least so far as the Removal of those Parties was concerned.

Have you ever given a different Character of this Man in conversing with any Person from that which you now give?
I dare say I have given an Impression under the Influence of the Moment at that particular Period; I might have connected him with his Brothers in manufacturing that threatening Notice; I do not know of any other Cause I had to attribute to him any improper Character or Conduct.

You say you have never given any different Character of this Man, except it might have been at that Time when you did entertain this Suspicion. Do you recollect passing over either to or from Ireland to Glasgow in the course of the last Summer?
Perfectly well.

Do you recollect, either in going or coming, having a Conversation upon this Subject in the Steam Boat?
Not on that particular School, but on Schools in general.

You do not recollect having any Conversation?
I recollect having a Conversation with a Gentleman, Mr. Colquhoun, on the Subject of Schools in general.

Do you recollect having any Communication with him on the Subject of this Erril School?
I do.

Recollect what you said to him of your Opinion of the Character of White?
I do not recollect that I said any thing about the Character of White; I do not recollect it at least, if I have.

Did you say of White that you thought him a Blackguard?
I do not recollect saying that.

Did you say that you thought him a Ribbonman, or a Disturber of the Peace?
I am sure I did not.

Do you think it possible you could have said that?
I do not, because I do not believe that he was a Ribbonman.

321

John Price, Esq.

Did you enter largely into White's Misbehaviour in respect of the public Peace, either as a Ribbonman or as a Disturber of it?
No; largely I did not; it was merely a Conversation on the Deck of the Vessel.

Did you say to him that White was a very bad Character?
I do not recollect that I did, and I do not believe that I did so, for I do not think that he is a bad Character; it was his Incompetency in the Management of the School that was my Objection to him.

Did you or did you not say that he was a very bad Character, and that he was indignant with you for having exposed his Mal-practices?
No, I am sure that I did not; I am as sure as I possibly can be that I did not, as far as I can be at such a Distance of Time; I suppose it was last October.

This is what it was possible for you to have stated of the Character of the Man whom you now describe to be a harmless inoffensive Person?
I said that he was a Tippler; that he was harmless and inoffensive; all I know of him I have described.

Of a Person whom you have described to this Committee as a harmless Man, and a loyal and peaceable Subject, is it possible that so late as last October you could have said of him that he was a Disturber of the Peace, that he was a very bad Character, and yet could have forgotten it?
I think it is impossible.

Then you are confident that you did not say it?
Quite confident.

You found that this Notice was written on National School Paper; what did you do in consequence; did you do any thing?
I summoned all the Persons that were suspected of it; there were some Persons in the Village of Erril that were suspected of it, and they were brought before the Magistrates.

When was that?
Shortly after it occurred.

Was White one of them?
No.

Who were they?
His Brother was the principal.

Did you ever talk on the Subject of this threatening Notice to the Reverend Mark Perrin?
Yes, repeatedly.

Do you recollect the first Time when you conversed with him upon this Subject?
I cannot say; he lived in my Parish; he was the Minister or Curate of my Parish, and we were frequently together, and I suppose the Moment that I heard of it, it was communicated to him.

Was it he that remarked its being National School Paper?
No, I think not; he did not see the Notice.

You told him that it was National School Paper?
Yes.

Did you go together to Erril?
Yes.

Did you go to the School together?
We did.

Into the School?
Into the School.

Did you say any thing to the Master upon the Subject of this threatening Notice?
No, not at that Time, nor at any Time, I believe.

John Price, Esq.

Had you the threatening Notice with you in the School?
No.

You had it not in your Possession at that Time?
No, I never had.

Had Mr. Perrin it in his Possession?
No.

Did you look through the Copy Books of the Boys?
We examined a Class or Two, and I dare say looked at the Copy Books.

What was your Object in going to the National School?
I had Business at that particular Moment in arranging the Farms, and I think it was his Wish to accompany me to see what I was doing with the Farms, and that led us by the School.

The Question is, what was your Reason for going to the National School?
As we passed by the School we went in to inspect it.

Was it for the sake of inspecting its Condition as a School merely?
I think it was.

Have you any Doubt of it?
I do not know; perhaps it might be to ascertain the Similitude of the Writing, which we did not see; but it might be with some view of that Kind; it was so immediately after the Notice was served that it might have been so; I cannot say, however, that it was so, for I really believe that we were merely passing by. He was anxious for my Safety, having heard of this Notice, and he came up with me to see how I was going on.

That might have been Part of your Motive?
I think it might have been.

Do you think it was?
I do not, indeed; I cannot give a positive Opinion upon it.

Did you stay in the School the whole Time that he did?
I did.

Did you look into the Copy Books of many of the Boys?
We looked at the Copies; not through them.

Did you see any thing remarkable in any of the Copies in the Schools?
No.

What did you do immediately afterwards?
We went to a Farm which I held under Lady Fitzpatrick in my own Hands, and after viewing that Farm, and walking about it, we came through the Townland of Erril, and we went into a Cottage belonging to the Widow Kilfoil.

Did you go again to the School?
No.

Did you send to the School for any thing?
We wanted some Paper; I forget for what Purpose; I think for making a Memorandum of the Number of Tenants that were to be sent off, or for some other Reason; but there was no Paper or Ink in the House, and we sent the Daughter of the Woman of the House for Paper, Pen, and Ink.

Where?
I believe she went to the School; the Copy Book that she brought back came from the School.

Did you tell her to go to the School?
I cannot recollect. The Schoolhouse was the next House; the Copy Book came from the School.

Was a Book brought from the School to you at that Time?
Yes.

Was there any thing remarkable in that Book?
Yes, there was.

What

John Price, Esq.

What was it?

On looking through the Copy Book Mr. Perrin discovered it. He said, "I always examine these Copy Books to see what Sentiments are written at the Head, and it gives one a very good Opportunity of ascertaining what the Feelings of the Masters are;" something of that Kind; and he found a Leaf at the End or in the Middle of the Book separated from the Copies, and which was written, either "A Lamentation for the poor Fellows who suffered at Maryborough," or "God be with the poor Fellows who died at Maryborough;" either the one or the other were the Words, that I recollect, and under that again were the Names of the Four Sufferers written.

That was the only Book you saw of that Copy?
The only Book.

Did you at any Time compare the threatening Notice with any Book that was in the School or had been brought out of the School?
No, not to my Recollection.

You have said that you thought it possible that you might have gone to the School with the Intention of looking at the Handwriting; did you in fact at any Time ever compare the Handwriting of the threatening Notice with the Handwriting of any Individual?
Not that I recollect. The Document I found in the Copy Book I sent off, about the poor Boys that died at Maryborough, to the National Board of Education.

Did the Committee understand you to say that the Piece of Paper upon which that Sentence was written was a loose Leaf in the Copy Book?
It was a Leaf of the Copy Book that I cut out.

Did it appear to be written in a fair Hand, as if the Boy had been practising in School when he wrote it?
It appeared to be written by the Boy's own Hand, for we looked at the Pieces that were set before in the Beginning of the Copy Book, and compared that with the Writing of the Boy.

It appeared to be written in that Kind of Manner in which a Boy would write if he was practising in the School?
Yes; but the Names of the Persons who suffered were written in Small Hand under it, and it was quite apart from the ordinary Copies; it was not continuous.

The Names of the Sufferers were apart, and in a different Scale of Writing from the rest?
Yes; in the same Writing, but of a different Size; the Names were put under these Words.

Was the Writer's Name put underneath?
It was not followed up as a Copy, or with the Name of the Writer.

It was only written once?
Exactly so. Mr. Perrin said, "This is a bad Thing, and I think you ought to take notice of it." I immediately cut it out of the Copy Book, and enclosed it to Mr. Kelly.

You accompanied it with a Letter?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

You were requested to produce some Documents; have you brought them?
I have.

Have you brought with you all the Papers that are in the Possession of the Board connected with Erril School?
Not all. The Notice desired me to bring all, and if I had had the Means

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

to write on Thursday Night to Dublin, that Notice should have been complied with. I was unable to write till Saturday, and of course cannot receive a Reply until Wednesday; however, the Papers connected with the Case I have here, which will, I conceive, be found sufficient. I have here all the Inspector's Reports upon the School, the original Letters of Mr. Price and Mr. Treacy, and my Replies. I have not the original Application, and that is the only material Document I think that I have not.

Have you the Books?
I have all the Books in Town, with the single Exception of the Book in which the Query Sheet or the original Application is entered, and the Books in which the Accounts of the several Grants paid to this School are entered.

Have you the Register Book and Report Book and the Class Book of the School?
The Register Book and the Report Book of the School are kept in the School; they are School Property; we do not take those out of the School.

Do you happen to know whether they happen to have more than One Set?
Yes; they must, I think, have had more than One Set, for this Reason, that they had a Set during the earlier Part of their Connexion with the Board, and lately the Board have supplied Register and Report Books upon an improved Plan to all the National Schools, and therefore it is that I conclude that they have had Two Sets.

And they have had nothing more in that School than has been given to other Schools?
No.

Will you give in those Papers?
I give in Reports of the Erril School for the Years 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836.

The Witness delivers in the same.

Does the Erril School still continue on the Board's List?
Yes.

Will you turn to the Correspondence between Mr. Price and the Board?
The Correspondence began with the Query Sheet which I have already stated I have not here, that is, the Reception of the School upon the Board's Books.

Have you a Letter from Mr. Price, transmitting to you a Part of the Copy Book of one of the Boys of the School?
I have that Letter in my Hand; it is dated the 23d of April 1834.

Have you the remaining Correspondence on that Subject?
I have.

Will you produce it?
The Correspondence on the Subject will necessarily involve the Correspondence that I have had upon it with Mr. Treacy also, and I have that here. The first Letter I have is the Letter of Mr. Price, dated 23d of April 1834, containing a Portion of that which is stated to be the Heading of a Copy pinned to it, Part of it having been torn or worn away by the Transmission of it to Mr. Treacy for Inspection, and its Transmission back to me, or other accidental Cause.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

"Sir, Westfield Farm, 23d April.

"On looking over the Children's Copy Books in Erril School, I found the enclosed very demoralizing Piece of Writing as a Heading for a future Copy. I think such Sentiments in any School would be sufficient Evidence of the Morals which were inculcated in it, but that they should have been permitted into a National School is quite too bad.

"I send

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

" I send it to you in order that you may place it in the Hands of your Inspector with a view not only that he may inquire into it, as also into the general Conduct and Competency of the Master, which I apprehend will not bear a close Scrutiny.

" I remain, Sir,
Your faithful Servant,
" To Thos. F. Kelly, Esq." J. B. Price."

Was any Answer sent from the Board to Mr. Price?
No.

What was the next Letter in the course of Correspondence?
The next Letter is a Letter from me to Mr. Treacy, dated the 28th of April.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, Education Office, 28th April 1836.
" The Commissioners direct me to enclose you the written Copy Line found in the Erril National School, and to state their Wish that you would set on foot an instant Inquiry as to how far the Teacher may stand implicated in either giving or permitting such to be in use.

" I remain yours,
" To Rev. W. Treacy, (Signed) Thos. F. Kelly."
Rathdowney."

The next Letter in the Correspondence is a Letter of the 21st of May 1834 from Mr. Treacy in reply to mine of April.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, Barry Hill, Rathdowney, 21st May 1834.
" I beg to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of the 28th April. I would have given it an earlier Answer, but deferred that I might be able to give the Commissioners the most accurate Information with regard to the Copy Line found in the Erril National School. I waited on Mr. Price, in the Hope he could accompany me to the School; but he was unable to attend. I made minute Inquiry on Two several Days, and the Result has been to fully satisfy me that the Teacher, Mr. White, was altogether ignorant of the Boy writing the Line. He wrote only the One Line; and from all I could learn I do not think he could write more without being observed by the Teacher, who, if he sanctioned it in any Way, would be of course quite unfit for his Situation; but I feel bound again to say that I believe him altogether incapable of it.

" I am, Sir,
Your faithful obedient Servant,
" Thos. F. Kelly, Esq." Wm. Treacy."

The next Letter is a Letter of Mr. Treacy's to me, dated the 22d April 1834.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, Barry Hill, Rathdowney, 22d April 1834.
" In reply to your Letter of the 18th Inst. I beg to state to you that there are Eighty-five Scholars in attendance at present in the Erril National School.
" It will, I hope, be in your Recollection, when I forwarded last September to you a Certificate of the Teacher's Competency and Attention, it had been considered satisfactory. You had at that Time remitted me *3l. 9s. 11d.*, the Salary due to him then. I have now only to state, as one of the Managers of said School, that he continues to go on very much to my Satisfaction. He is a moral, well-conducted young Man; spent some Time in the Training School, Kildare Place; received from Mr. Vivion a Certificate of his Competency to teach. I frequently go to the School, and always find him in close Attendance.

" I am, Sir,
Your faithful humble Servant,
" Thos. F. Kelly, Esq." Wm. Treacy, P. P."

The next Letter is a Letter from Mr. Price to me, dated the 25th of September in the same Year.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

"Sir, Westfield Farm, 25th Sept.

"I duly received your Letter of the 19th Inst., acquainting me that your Inspector had reported 'the Teacher in the *Castletown School* as inert and unsuited to the Duties of *that School.*' I apprehend that his Report must have reference to the Master in the Erril School, and not to the Castletown Master, who, from the enclosed Memorandum entered by Mr. Dean on the Face of the daily Roll, was thought rather favourably of. White, the Teacher in the Erril School, is certainly a *complete Failure;* he has not one redeeming Quality; in fact, I have long since ceased to visit *that* School. But it is a rare Accident to meet with a competent Teacher in that Part of the Country, and a Stranger *qualified* to teach would not be induced to go there for the present Income. I should be very happy to accept a Teacher of your Nomination, and I am convinced that if the Responsibility of appointing Teachers rested entirely with the Board, instead of the Patron, the National System of Education would be more complete, and freed from the conflicting Opinions which sometimes occur, as well as the *Prejudices* or *Partialities* which to a very great Extent influence the Appointment of Masters. I enclose a Receipt for Michael Quinn's Salary.

"I am, Sir,
Your very faithful Servant,
J. B. Price."

"Thos. F. Kelly, Esq."

The next Letter is a Letter from me to Mr. Price, dated the 16th Day of December 1835.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

"Sir, Education Office, 16th December 1835.

"It appearing from the Inspector's Report that the Erril National School is not conducted with Efficiency, and that the Teacher is both negligent and incompetent, I am directed by the Commissioners of Education to request that the present Master may be removed and a Person appointed in his Place, who may from Attention to his Duties and Capability warrant the Board in continuing their Assistance to the School,

"I remain yours,
(Signed) Thos. F. Kelly."

"To John R. Price, Esq.,
Mountrath."

The next Letter is a Letter also from me to Mr. Price, dated the 27th May 1836.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

"Sir, Education Office, 27th May 1836.

"The Commissioners of Education having had before them the Inspector's Report on the Erril National School direct me to express their great Surprise that it has been allowed to be so badly conducted in almost every Particular, and they desire me to send you a Copy of the Inspector's Observation as attached to the several Interrogatories which he is obliged to answer for their Information. He states,—

"That the general Lesson was not hung up within the Walls of the School.

"That the School Rules have not been obtained.

"That a Catechism was found by him in the Hands of one of the Children during School Business.

"That no List of Free Stock was in the School, and all the Books (except those on Science) so abused, that it was impossible for him to give an Account of them.

"That the Accounts of the Proficiency and Attendance of the Children were not kept regularly.

"That the School did not appear to be at all conducted with Efficiency.

"That the Teacher's neglectful Habits disqualify him for his Office.

"That the School was in the worst State, the Scholars doing next to nothing; no System or Arrangements of any Kind.

"The Books almost useless, and the Schoolroom filthy in the Extreme.

"The

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

" The Board direct me to call upon you for an Explanation on these several Points reported by their Inspector, as without it they cannot think of continuing Aid to a School which is so discreditably conducted, and I am at the same Time to remind you that White the Teacher was but on Trial until the Report of the Inspector should have arrived.

" I remain yours,
(Signed) Thos. F. Kelly."

Same as the above, and same Date, sent to the Rev. William Treacy, " Rathdowney."

The next Letter is a Letter from me to Mr. Treacy, dated the 27th of July 1836.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, 27th July 1836.

" In reply to your Letter of the 14th Instant, I am directed to repeat the Order of the Board in reference to the Teacher of Erril National School as communicated to Mr. Price, namely, that he (the Teacher) be forthwith removed from the Charge of the School, as being totally unfitted for that Situation, and that a Person be appointed in his Place who by reason of Attention and Competency may warrant the Commissioners in continuing their Assistance."

" Rev. Wm. Treacy, Rathdowney."

The next Letter bears the Date of the 21st of October 1836, from me to Mr. Treacy.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, 21st October 1836.

" The Commissioners of Education have had before them the Inspector's Report, the former Correspondence which was carried on with respect to White, the Teacher of Erril National School, and also your Letter of the 8th Instant; and finding that School has suffered considerably under his (White's) Superintendence, and that the Opportunities which had been afforded by them for Amendment have been totally thrown away and neglected, they have ordered the Salary to be discontinued to the School after the 31st Ultimo, and not to be restored until a proper Person be appointed in his Place.

" Thos. F. Kelly."

" Rev. W. Treacy, Rathdowney."

The next Letter bears Date 12th November 1836, from me to Mr. Treacy.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, 12th November 1836.

" I request that you will have the goodness to send up White, the late Teacher of Erril National School, to this Office without Delay. His travelling Expenses will be defrayed.

(Signed) " Thos. F. Kelly."

" Rev. Mr. Treacy, Rathdowney."

The next Letter is one from me to Mr. Price, bearing Date the 20th February 1837, with one to Mr. Treacy of the same Date and in the same Words, from me also.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

" Sir, 20th February 1837.

" The Commissioners of Education have had submitted to them the Report of the Superintendent of the Training and Model Department upon White, the Teacher of the Erril National School whilst under his Care, pursuant to their Directions, and find him represented as a Person of a very inferior Class of Acquirements, and not capable of being improved. They therefore desire me to intimate to you their Acquiescence in their former Order for his Removal from the Charge of this School being now carried into effect. They at the same Time rely that in effecting this Change you will have due Regard to the Interests of the School in appointing a fitting Successor, and to White himself in giving him fair Notice.

(Signed) " Thos. F. Kelly."

" J. R. Price, Esq., Rathdowney."

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

These are all the Letters which, as I have stated, I at present have of the Correspondence relating to that Subject.

Relative to the Erril School?

Yes; there is One here relative to an Affidavit made in the Case, but it does not bear upon this Point.

Have you with you the Books of the Proceedings of the Board?

Yes; I keep the Minutes in my own Handwriting of the Board, and from that I have extracted in my own Handwriting all Minutes of the Board relative to this Circumstance of the Erril School.

The Witness delivers in the same, which is read, and is as follows:

"Minutes of Board.

"20th October 1836.

"Present:—Rev. Dr. Sadlier, A. R. Blake and Robert Holmes, Esquires.

"On Report and Letter of Mr. Treacy, Ordered, that upon full Consideration of these Documents Salary be discontinued to this School from and after the 30th Ultimo, and until another Teacher be appointed to its Superintendence in the Place of White."

"24th November 1836.

"Present:—Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Dr. Sadleir, Rev. Mr. Carlisle, and A. R. Blake, Esq.

"Considered the Minutes of the 20th Ultimo, with reference to the Teacher of the Erril National School: Ordered, that this Minute be varied, and that White be admitted for training in the present Class of Teachers."

"9th February 1837.

"Duke of Leinster, Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Dr. Sadleir, Rev. Mr. Carlisle, and Right Hon. A. R. Blake.

"Upon Request conveyed through the Secretary, Mr. Price was admitted to an Interview, in order to ascertain the Opinion of the Commissioners with respect to White the Teacher of the Erril National School; whereupon it was ordered, that Dr. M'Arthur's Report upon the Conduct and Capability of White, whilst in the Model School, be laid before the Commissioners, and that then a Communication be made to Mr. Price."

"16th February.

"Same Board.

"Brought up Dr. M'Arthur's Report upon White, Teacher of the Erril National School: Ordered, that upon Consideration of this Report it is not considered to be desirable that White should continue in the Superintendence of this School, and that the Patrons be made acquainted with this Resolution accordingly."

Have you the Reports of the Inspector?

Yes; I have the Report of the Erril School for the Years 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836.

Have you also put in the Account of any Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board upon any of the Reports of the Inspectors upon that School?

I have delivered in all the Minutes of the Board relative to the Erril School.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

John Price, Esq.

JOHN PRICE Esquire is again called in, and further examined as follows:

Do you remember writing this Letter on the 23d of April 1834 (*the Letter being handed to the Witness*)? Is that your Handwriting?

It is.

The

329

John Price, Esq.

The Letter is read, and is as follows :

" Sir, Westfield Farm, 23d April.

" On looking over the Children's Copy Books in Erril School, I found the enclosed very demoralizing Piece of Writing as a Heading for a future Copy. I think such Sentiments in any School would be sufficient Evidence of the Morals which were inculcated in it, but that they should have been permitted in a National School is quite too bad. I send it to you in order that you may place it in the Hands of your Inspector, with a view not only that he may inquire into it, as also into the general Conduct and Competency of the Master, which I apprehend will not bear a close Scrutiny.

" I remain,
Dear Sir,
Your faithful Servant,
J. B. PRICE."

After having written that Letter how long was it before you received any Answer?

With respect to that Letter I do not recollect that I got any Answer.

Did you consider yourself aggrieved by the Conduct of the Board in not sufficiently early attending to your Complaint in that respect?

No; I do not recollect that I did.

You have stated in this Letter, "I send it to you in order that you may place it in the Hands of your Inspector, with a view not only that he may inquire into it, as also into the general Conduct and Competency of the Master, which I apprehend will not bear a close Scrutiny." You appear there by those Words to say that the general Conduct of the Master will not bear a close Scrutiny; did you mean that?

Certainly.

By general Conduct did you mean general Conduct in reference to the conducting of the School merely?

Merely in reference to the Conduct and Management of the School.

In short, you use that as another Expression for general Incompetency?

Yes; without any Reference to his Moral Character.

The general Conduct, in your Use of the Word on that Occasion, had no Reference whatever to any thing but what the next Word referred to, that is, Competency?

I really think it had Reference to his Want of Attention and his tippling; and, as I said before, it had Reference to his Character as disorderly and given to tipple; in fact, I suspected him of being disposed to drink. But in contradistinction to his Character as a loyal or disloyal Subject, I had no Intention of applying Disloyalty to him, or of describing him as a Man who was combined with any Faction.

Are you aware in whose Handwriting this Heading of the Copy Book was?

It was in the Handwriting of a Boy of the Name of Fitzpatrick, I understand, but I am not aware of it myself; that the Copy Book belonged to a Boy of the Name of Fitzpatrick.

Does any Boy write his own Heading to his Copy?

I am not aware; I believe they write from Pieces put before them; I believe the National School supply Pieces, which they copy.

They also copy from Passages which are given to them?

Yes, if they have them, and in the Absence of them the Master sets Copies for them.

Then your Inference is that this Passage must have been written by the Master if not sent down by the Society?

No; it was quite away from the Copies. Mr. Perrin looked through the Copy Book, and in the latter End of the Copy Book, away from the other Copies, found this written in the Hand of a Child or a Boy. The Beginning of it

John Price, Esq.

it might have been written as a Copy, but the Names of the Persons who suffered, the Men that were hanged, were written in a small scratchy Hand under it, which precluded the Possibility of its being intended as a Copy.

Can you state what the Heading was?
The Heading, as well as I recollect, was, "A Lamentation for the poor Fellows who died — who suffered in Maryborough."

Could this Heading have been disconnected with the Names of the Parties underneath?
The Names of the Parties were written immediately under in a small Hand. A Copy either set or otherwise copied from a Piece generally occupies One Line; this occupied Two Lines, besides the smaller Lines in Small Hand of the Boy who wrote the Names.

Could the Heading have meant any thing but to refer to the Names of those Parties which were appended to it?
It think it had certainly Reference to the Persons, because it mentioned the Names of the Persons who were hanged, and it was apparently a Lamentation for those Men who suffered the Sentence of the Law in Maryborough.

The Names were written in the Boy's Hand?
I should suppose so; in a smaller Hand.

Could the Heading have had Reference to any thing but the Execution of those Murderers, without the Names being inserted?
I should think it had Reference to the Executions that took place, even if the Names were not there, from the Words "A Lamentation for the poor Fellows who suffered in Maryborough," and that immediately following the Assizes must have had Reference to the Persons who suffered.

Did it appear to be written in a different Handwriting from the Names?
The Names appeared to be written in a smaller Handwriting.

What Reason have you to suppose that it was the same Boy that wrote both?
It was a smaller Handwriting, and looked to be the same Ink and the same Character; one Line was large, and the next a smaller, and the Names were smaller than either.

Then it had the Appearance of being merely a Composition of the same Boy?
I think so.

You stated in this Letter that it appeared as the Heading for a future Copy; you are quite certain that it was not the Writing of the Master?
I should think that it was not; it did not occur to me at the Time, comparing it with the previous Copies that were set, to see whether it was in the same Handwriting.

Did you, in point of fact, compare it with the other?
We did, in the Cottage. It would appear from that Letter that I looked over the Copy Books in the School; that is not the Fact.

Then when you used the Expression, "you had found the Copy in the School," you, from Inadvertence or otherwise, stated "in the School," when you ought to have stated "in the Cottage"?
Yes, and perhaps it was to make my Complaint stronger; but it was literally sent for to the School, and I was in the Cottage when we examined the Copy Book, and there detected this Sentence.

You do not know whether it was or was not the Handwriting of the Master, but you think not?
I think not.

Had you any Reason to suspect any particular Boy?
A Boy of the Name of Fitzpatrick.

Did

John Price, Esq.

Did you suspect that from comparing it with his Handwriting?
No.

How old is that Boy?
Fourteen or Fifteen.

Had it been long written?
No; it appeared to be quite recently written. I was nervous on seeing such a Sentence after the Notice that was posted against myself. In ordinary Times I should not have taken such Notice of it as I would, connected, as it might appear to be, with the threatening Notice that had been posted against myself.

Is it possible that without gross Carelessness, supposing it to have been written by this Boy, the Master should not have known that it was in the Book?
I think it is quite possible, unless he examined the entire of the Copy Books. It was written, as I said before, not consecutively after the previous Copy, but in another Part of the Copy Book.

So that there were blank Leaves intervening?
Yes.

Did you ever mention it to the Master?
I believe I did, but I had given up the Master altogether at the Time, but perhaps I did.

Did he appear surprised at it, or not?
He denied it, I suppose; but I do not recollect my mentioning it to the Master. I do not think he was summoned to the Court.

You state in your Letter that this Writing which you describe as demoralizing would be sufficient Evidence of the Morals which were inculcated in the School. When you afterwards spoke of the Conduct of the Master, did not you connect it in your own Mind with the Morals that you suppose might be inculcated in the School, as well as with his general Competency as a Teacher?
Certainly; all those Circumstances,—the threatening Notice posted up, this following on its Heels,—all flashed on my Mind as showing the State of the Country, that there was a diseased State of Society, and that what in ordinary Times might not have excited my Observation ought to be more minutely inquired into.

Then in point of fact the Remark upon the Conduct of the Master had Reference to the Morals which he might be supposed to inculcate?
Yes; which he might be supposed.

What led to your Examination of the Copy Books?
There was only One Copy Book examined. I wanted a Pen, Ink, and Paper for some Purpose, and we sent from the Cottage the Daughter of the Widow who owned the Cottage to the School or adjoining House. The Copy Book was brought back by that Person. Out of that Copy Book I took Paper for the Purpose of writing or making some Memorandum; while doing so Mr. Perrin examined that Copy Book, and in that Copy Book he detected that Sentence.

Did you not examine some of the other Copy Books in the School?
No; we might have looked at the Writing, but we did not examine so as to go through the Leaves.

You did not go to the School after you had received the Copy Book in the Cottage?
No.

In this Letter you say, "In looking over the Children's Copy Books in Erril School I found the enclosed very demoralizing Piece of Writing as a Heading for a future Copy." You will perceive that you state in this Letter that you have looked over the Children's Copy Books in the Erril School?
That may be easily accounted for by my making the Matter stronger for the

John Price, Esq.

the Board. I stated that I found it in the School, whereas it was a Copy Book brought from the School to me in the Cottage.

The Committee understand you to say that you explain this Sentence, which has been read from the Letter, by stating that you wished to put the Thing in a stronger Light than the mere Fact was in your Communication to the Board?

The real Fact I did not wish to distort, but that it was in the Erril School that this happened, and that they were responsible for that Sentence, and that it should be inquired into. I thought that it was unimportant whether I stated that I found it in Widow Kilfoil's Cottage or in the School, but that it was a Copy taken from the Erril School I thought important to convey to the Board in the strongest Language that I could.

Then in order to convey this Fact to the Board in the strongest Way you could, you stated that which at the Time you knew to be incorrect?

If I thought that I was stating a Falsehood I would not do it, but I must have known that it was incorrect to state that it was in the School I examined the Copy Book.

You are confident from your Recollection of what passed in your Mind that this was not the correct Statement?

So far as finding it in the School it was not a correct Statement.

Is it possible that you might have meant to convey an Impression in writing that Letter, not that you were examining a Copy Book in the School, but that you were examining the Book they used in Erril School?

I dare say that at the Time it must have been my Intention to convey simply that a Copy Book belonging to Erril School was examined by me, and in it was found this Sentence.

You dare say that that was your Intention; when you wrote that did it imply that you had seen some Copy Books in the School?

Whatever the Intentions were at the Time I wrote that Letter, the Truth and the positive Fact is, that I only looked through One Copy Book, and in that I found this demoralizing Sentence, and that that Copy Book was brought from the Erril School.

Did you write that Letter to the Board under a Feeling of great Anxiety that the Board might be induced to cause some Inquiry to be made into the State of the School, which upon the whole you apprehended not to be in a satisfactory State?

Most decidedly; I was most anxious that the Attention of the Board should be more particularly drawn to the State of that School.

You were led therefore to lay as strong a Stress as you possibly could upon any Circumstances which had occurred, for the Purpose of inducing that Inquiry to take place which you thought extremely necessary?

I think so; I am certain that I was.

And you were at the Time in a considerable Degree of Anxiety about your own personal Safety?

I cannot say that I thought Injury would be done to me personally; but the Business I had in hand, connected with the threatening Notice and the State of the Country, all combined to make me look very minutely and very sharply at a Sentence of that Kind.

After you had written the important Letter which is on the Table of the Committee to the Board, did the Board make Inquiry by sending their Inspector to Erril School?

I understood that they did, but the Inspector did not call upon me.

How long was it after you had written this Letter?

Very shortly, as I understood.

Did you, as Agent of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, continue the Patronage of these Ladies to the School?

I went pari passu with the Board; I never abandoned the School till the Board wrote me Word to remove the Master.

Was

John Price, Esq.

Was the Master removed?
The Master was ordered to be removed, but did not remove; he did not give me up the Possession.

In what Year was that?
In the latter End of the Year 1835. It was not in consequence of that Sentence, but in consequence of the Inspector finding the School in a State of Disorganization, or that the Master was incompetent.

Did the Board continue to give a Gratuity to the Master in 1835?
The Master was kept on for another Half Year, till he had another Trial.

Is he now Master of the School?
No, he is not; he continues to live in the School, or at least he is in the House.

The Schoolmaster lodges in the House?.
Yes; there is a House attached to the School, in which there is a living Room, and he lives in it.

Is he permitted to stay in the House?
He is staying against my Consent.

Does he receive any Salary from the Ladies Fitzpatrick or the Board now?
I ceased paying him in January 1836.

Why have you not put him out of the School?
There is no Law to enable me to do it with Safety. It was brought before the Magistrates, and the Magistrates gave an Authority to remove him. I doubted the Magistrates Authority, and took Mr. Martley's Opinion on the Point; he advised me not to use Force. I often spoke to the Board that it would be very necessary to have a summary Process for removing Schoolmasters. The Magistrates were of opinion that they had the Power, and they did in point of fact give me an Authority; I doubted that Authority, and I thought it was safe to send a Case to Mr. Martley for his Opinion, and he gave it, advising the contrary.

You determined to guide yourself by Mr. Martley's Opinion?
Yes.

You are Magistrate for the Queen's County, and Agent for the Ladies Fitzpatrick?
Yes.

Do not you think that this was a Case connected with the Peace and good Order of the Country, which would almost justify you in an Application to the Legislature for an Enactment of a Law with respect to turning the Man out?
I should think not; I would not feel myself justified on such Grounds to apply to the Legislature for an Alteration of the Law.

He was receiving Pay from the Ladies Fitzpatrick?
Up to the End of the Year 1835, or I may say January 1836.

Could you not have turned him out under the Law as a Servant?
I think not; I have taken one of the best Opinions in Dublin upon it, Mr. Martley's.

Had you paid any Rent for the Ground?
No, but still there was a permissive Possession.

Did Mr. Martley state to you that you had no Power to turn out a Schoolmaster at any Time whom you yourself had placed in that School as a Schoolmaster?
He stated distinctly that he would not advise me to take summary Possession of the School, or to use Force; but if I got the Master out, I might go in and take Possession, and shut the Doors and keep him out.

John Price, Esq.

Then in fact the Master is now holding forcible Possession of the Schoolhouse belonging to the Board of Education in that Country?

He is holding forcible Possession of a Schoolhouse, but it does not belong to the Board.

To whom does it belong?

To the Ladies Fitzpatrick. A Portion of the Money is public Money, and was obtained, as I stated, from the Lord Lieutenant's Funds applicable to the building of Schoolhouses in Ireland.

That House now belongs to the Ladies Fitzpatrick?

There are Leases prepared, which have never been executed, to make it over to Trustees.

Since that Letter which you addressed to Mr. Kelly, Secretary of the Board, have you had any Letter of Intimidation from any Person, with a view to deter you from dismissing the Schoolmaster from his Situation?

Certainly not; no Intimidation of any Kind.

You state that you received a Grant for that School from the Lord Lieutenant's Fund?

Yes.

Were you aware that in receiving that Grant you were bound to execute Leases to Trustees?

I was.

Did the Government to whom you applied require you to execute the Leases?

They sent me the Leases, and they have never been executed; nobody applied to me from that Day to this.

In what Year was it?

In 1826. The Erril School was put under the Hibernian Society in 1823, and ceased in 1825. When the present Schoolhouse was built 100*l.* was advanced from the Lord Lieutenant's Fund, and the other 100*l.* by the Ladies Fitzpatrick.

Did you fill up the Query Sheet that was sent to you at the Time that you applied to the Lord Lieutenant's Fund for the Grant?

I suppose I did, but I have no Recollection of it.

You do not recollect that there was any Stipulation upon that Grant being made as to your engaging to keep up the Salary for a Master for that School?

No, there was no Stipulation of that Kind, certainly; there was no Stipulation of a Master being kept in it that I recollect. In the first instance, after it was built, it was kept under the Kildare Place Society, then it became a Barrack in the disturbed Times, and was used as a Police Station, and when the National Board was formed it was placed in connexion with it.

Had you any Communication with the Parish Priest with respect to this Copy?

Not with respect to the Copy, but with respect to the Master.

What passed?

He was very anxious that I should intercede with the Board for his Continuance, that I should withdraw any Sort of Opposition; that he would join me in visiting the School, and make it an efficient School; that his Object and mine was the same, and that if I withdrew my Opposition to the Master he would certainly pay more Attention, and that in the event of its not improving he would join me in looking out for a better Master.

Was the Schoolmaster a Roman Catholic?

Yes.

Did it appear to you that the Roman Catholic Priest was inclined to favour the Master?

No doubt he patronized him very much; they were all Roman Catholic Children who attended the School.

John Price, Esq.

After what you informed him had taken place with respect to the Copy Book?
I did not inform of it; I communicated with him about the Master afterwards, but as to that particular Point I did not communicate with Mr. Treacy.

Does he continue to favour him still?
I do not know; he had always a good Opinion of him.

Is Mr. Treacy, in your Opinion, one of the Priests in Ireland who are considered Agitators?
No, he is not.

He is considered a peaceable and loyal Subject?
I have heard nothing to the contrary, and I believe he is as peaceable as I am myself.

You do believe him peaceable?
Yes.

When you refrained from acting on the Opinion of the Magistrates in ejecting this Man from the House, did you do so upon the Doubt of their Law, or from an Apprehension that your ejecting him might create Excitement and might produce Violence?
It was a Doubt of their Authority; the Opinion that I entertained myself was that they acted wrong in giving me that Authority. I was not at home at the Time. I left the Case with my Attorney to see what could be done, and nothing was done. I had been in communication with Mr. Franks, who is our Law Agent in Dublin, and he advised me to be guarded.

Mr. Martley is an eminent Counsel at the Irish Bar?
He is.

Had you Reason to suspect that a Boy of the Name of Fitzpatrick was the Writer of those Lines?
I was told that he was the Writer.

And you mentioned his Age?
I saw the Boy lately, and I should think he was about Fifteen now.

At what Time did you examine the Copies; how long ago?
About this Time Three Years.

You do not know that that was the Boy who wrote these Words?
No.

Have you any special Reason for knowing it?
No; the only Reason I have for knowing it is, that since I received the Summons from this House I spoke to a Person who said he knew who was the Boy, and the old Father and his Son came to my House soon after.

Will you take this Letter in your Hand, (*a Letter being handed to the Witness, dated the 25th of September* 1834,) and read that Part which belongs to White:—"White, a Teacher in the Erril School, is certainly a complete Failure; he has not One redeeming Quality; in fact, I have long since ceased to visit that School." Is that the same School and the same Master to which you have referred?
Yes.

Did the supposed Conversation that is stated to have taken place between you and Mr. Colquhoun take place in returning from Scotland to Ireland?
Yes.

So that Mr. Colquhoun was going to Ireland at the Time that this Conversation took place?
Yes.

As a Magistrate of Queen's County, and Agent of a large Property, do you think that the Conduct of Mr. White is dangerous to the Peace of the Country, and injurious to the good Management of the Estate?
Injurious, as far as being an imperfect and incompetent Master.

John Price, Esq.

With respect to holding forcible Possession of the Schoolhouse?
No, I do not think that it is to be looked at in that Way; in a qualified Sense, all Force is injurious to the Country.

You did not consider it as seriously affecting the general Management of the Estate?
No.

What Steps have you taken to turn out this Person?
Served him with Notice to quit.

And he has refused to obey it?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

JOHN COLQUHOUN Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

You reside mainly in Scotland, in the County of Dumbarton?
I do.

That County you represented in Parliament up to a certain Period?
To the End of 1834.

Did you go over to Ireland in the course of the last Year?
I crossed to Ireland in the Month of October.

Did you on board the Packet in which you sailed meet with a Gentleman named Mr. Price?
I did.

Was it the Gentlemen whom you have seen just now?
It was.

Had you any Conversation with him on any Subjects that were interesting to you as to the State of Ireland?
I had Conversation with him on the Subject of the National Board of Education and the National Schools; that was a Subject that engaged my Attention, and on which I therefore felt interested in hearing his Communications.

Did he make any Communication with respect to one School in particular, a School named Erril?
I have no Remembrance of the Name, and I certainly do not recollect it by that Name; he made a Communication to me respecting a School which was on the Ladies Fitzpatrick's Estate.

What was the Name of the Master?
The Name of the Master he said was one White; I have not his Christian Name.

Did you take any Memorandum at the Time?
I did; feeling an Interest in the Subject, and thinking that Mr. Price's Communication was curious, and coincident with some Impressions which I had formed from previous Inquiry, I at the Time that Mr. Price was speaking to me took Memoranda in Pencil of the Heads of his Conversation, and these Memoranda I afterwards inserted in my Travelling Journal.

Have you got those Memoranda with you now?
I have copied out on this Slip of Paper the Heads which I put down in my Journal Book.

Will you read them to the Committee; is there a Date to them?
There is a Date in my Journal; I have it not here.

It was in the course of last October?
Yes.

Did you insert it immediately in your Journal upon your having the Conversation with Mr. Price?
I inserted it upon my Arrival in Dublin the following Day.

From

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

From Pencil Memoranda made while he was talking?
Yes.

Will you read it?
"On the Ladies Fitzpatrick's Estate, the National School, Master, White, Mr. Price found a Boy had written a Copy regretting those who fell at Maryborough. White a Man of very bad Character." Perhaps I ought to state that the Words that I put down were "a great Blackguard," from the Communication. I do not mean to say that Mr. Price used those Words, but that the Impression that I formed from the Account which he gave was that White was a Man of exceedingly bad Character. "White indignant at Mr. Price for exposing him." I should mention here, that these were the Heads which were put down in my Journal, but which do not by any means represent the whole Amount of Mr. Price's Conversation with me; they were Memoranda, intended to convey to my Mind the Conversation, being satisfied that my Memory would fill up the Variety of Points that I might safely trust it to carry, putting down only the Heads in the Journal.

Will you proceed?
"Mr. Price received a Warning with a Drawing of his Coffin, written on the National School Paper." That I think is all which relates to that School.

You say that those were the Heads which you put down to help your Memory; does your Memory serve you as to any larger Communications made by Mr. Price respecting either the School or the Master?
I have a Recollection—it is not so distinct—that in speaking of White's Character Mr. Price spoke of him as a Person,—he either used the Expression Ribbonman, or the Leader of Ribbonmen, or some such Expression. I have it in my Mind, and I have no Doubt that it was conveyed to it from Mr. Price's Conversation. I of course could not have imagined it; but the Impression is that he said something about Ribbonmen,—that he was connected with Ribbonmen or was himself a Ribbonman.

Did he enter at all upon the Misconduct of White, either as a Ribbonman, or an Agitator, or any thing of the Sort?
Not further. If he had said to me, which I think he did say, that he was a Ribbonman, or connected with Ribbonmen, I, of course, should have put no further Question to him as to White's Character, being satisfied that that Description was sufficiently emphatic.

How soon after the Conversation that took place with Mr. Price did you make a Memorandum of the Result, as you considered it to be, of the Conversation you had with him?
Whilst Mr. Price was speaking I was writing. It occurred on the Deck of the Steam Boat; and whilst Mr. Price was stating to me the Facts and the Names, I, not wishing to trust my Memory with the Names, or the more prominent Facts, did within a Book which I had in my Hand, and on the Back of a Letter, write down the Names and the prominent Facts, and those Names and Facts I inserted in my Journal Book on the following Day on arriving in Dublin.

The general Impression upon your Mind was that Mr. Price had told you, though you have not noted that down, that Mr. White was a Ribbonman?
Yes.

You were then in the habit of taking Notes relating to the Conduct of the National Schools in Ireland?
Yes, I was. I had made an Inquiry from personal Inspection of several of the Schools in the Month of August for Purposes of my own, and in inquiring at that Time I took Notes of what I saw; and Mr. Price having accidentally, without Solicitation of mine, come upon the Subject of Ireland, and upon the Subject of the National Schools, I found that one of the Points upon which he was speaking was the Point upon which I was specially inquiring.

Namely, the Conduct of the National Board in Ireland?
Yes; and therefore I had recourse to Pencil and Paper in order not to trust my Memory with Facts which I thought exceedingly important.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

You were then informing yourself generally, whilst you were in Ireland, of the Conduct of the Schools under the National Board?
I was.

Was that one of the Objects of your Journey to Ireland?
It was one of the Objects. I made it a Point to examine every School in the North of Ireland through which I travelled; I went into, without almost any Exception (where the Convenience of travelling would allow), every National School within the Range of my Tour.

Were you in Dublin in the course of this Inquiry?
On this Occasion I was going to Dublin. The Inquiry to which I am now alluding took place in the Month of August; the Conversation with Mr. Price was on a Second Visit in the Month of October.

How long were you in Dublin?
I was in Dublin a Week or Eight Days.

Are you acquainted with the Archbishop of Dublin?
I am, very well.

Did you see him while you were in Dublin?
I did.

Did you make any Representation of the Facts as stated to you, upon the Subject of the National Schools, to the Archbishop of Dublin?
My only Communication with the Archbishop was a friendly Communication at his own House as a Guest, and upon that Occasion the Conversation did turn upon the Subject of the National System, to the general Principles of which I offered some Objection with the Delicacy becoming my Years, and one acquainted with him, but I made no Representation to him on the Point referred to.

You made no Representation whatever to him upon the Subject of Schools?
None.

Then you did not attach sufficient Importance to the Conversation you had had with Mr. Price respecting the School placed under the Board to avail yourself of the Opportunity of seeing the Archbishop of Dublin so soon afterwards, of making him acquainted with the Fact and your Comment upon it?
I attached the highest possible Importance to the Facts, as I did to many of the Facts which I had observed in my personal Inspection, but I should not have considered it at all consistent with many Circumstances to make a Representation to one of the Persons whose Opinions I knew to be so decided upon that Subject as the Archbishop of Dublin's were.

Not now adverting to the System of Education generally, or any Objections you may have to it, but to the Misconduct of a particular School, do you consider that the Archbishop of Dublin would have approved of the Conduct of Mr. White as stated to you by Mr. Price?
Certainly not; I am sure that the Archbishop of Dublin would most highly have disapproved of it; but my Duty was not, I conceive, to make Representation to the Archbishop of Dublin of Things which I could not enter into with the Minuteness that would have been necessary to make such a Statement to the Archbishop of Dublin. My Object was to satisfy myself of some Points which I thought illustrative of the System, and this Point I took to be illustrative of the System.

Did you state to any body the Opinion you had formed, and the Facts you had collected from Mr. Price and others?
I think I stated to One intimate Friend, and One only, in Dublin, the Facts which I had noted; certainly only to One.

Who was that Person to whom you stated it?
If it is wished by your Lordships I will give it.

It is quite within the Scope of the Inquiry of this Committee?
The Person to whom I stated them was the Reverend Mortimer O'Sullivan.

Did

339

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Did you consider that the Reverend Mortimer O'Sullivan had Power to correct the Mischief which would arise from the Misconduct of a School under the Conduct of the National Board?

I stated the Fact to Mr. O'Sullivan, not with a view to making the Subject publicly known, otherwise I should have stated it to others, particularly to Members of Parliament; but I stated it to him, as I before mentioned, as a very intimate personal Friend of my own.

Have you any Doubt that if the Archbishop of Dublin had been acquainted by a Person in whom he placed Confidence with the Misconduct of a School under the National Board, and particularly of its being conducted by a Person of seditious Character, that he would have taken Steps to inquire into that Evil, and to remove it?

I have no Doubt that he would have taken all the Steps which were in his Power; how far those Steps could be successful in removing the Evils is another Question, upon which I have my own Opinion.

Not alluding to the Evils of the System of Education, but to the particular Case mentioned by you, of a School under the National Board being conducted by a Person of seditious Character, have you any Doubt that it would have been in the Archbishop of Dublin's Power to take Steps at least towards the Removal of such an Evil?

I am quite sure that it would have been the Archbishop's most earnest Wish to remove that or any Abuse in the System; but whether it was in the Archbishop's Power I may be allowed to say that I entertained the very greatest Doubt; and I entertain the Doubt in consequence of some Remarks of Mr. Price with regard to another School, which I rather think is on the Marquis of Lansdowne's Estate, the School of Shangannaghmore; from some Remarks which Mr. Price made with regard to that School I was led to infer that the Power of the Commissioners to correct Abuses was very limited.

Would it have been in the Power of the Archbishop of Dublin, as one of the leading Commissioners, to remove any Evil of that Sort without being made acquainted with it?

Clearly not.

Then you were led to withhold that Knowledge from him from the Belief that he either would not or could not have taken any Steps towards the Removal of that Evil?

I was led from a full Conviction of his Inability to meet the Evil,—of the Inability of the Archbishop, or any Member of the Board, to correct those Evils.

And your Opinion of that Inability was so strong as to induce you to withhold from the Knowledge of the Board, and even those Members of it with whom you might be acquainted, any Facts that came to your Knowledge upon that Subject?

Certainly it was; though I was convinced that of the Education Board, many of the Members, I should probably say the whole Members, had the Wish, but had not the Power. I should consider it quite useless to make Representations, the more especially as the Members of the Board would differ entirely from me, and would believe that they had the Power to correct the Evil.

Therefore you would consider yourself as only warranted in communicating the Representations which had been made to you to Persons whom you knew to be Enemies of the National System, and not to Persons who were concerned in promoting it?

My Object certainly would not have been to make the Representation to Enemies of the National System, because, though I had Communication with many in Dublin whom your Lordships would designate as Enemies of the National System, I made no Communication to them; I made a Communication to One only of the many whom I saw in Dublin opposed to the System, and that One was a personal and intimate Friend of my own; I made no Communication to him as an Enemy of the National Board, because, if I had wished to do this, I would have made the Communication to others more

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

influential from their Position in Parliament, and therefore able to injure the National Board to a greater Extent than Mr. O'Sullivan, whose Influence on that Question is not so great; but I reserved my Information in order to make the Communication either to the Public or to Parliament.

You cannot be ignorant of the Fact that Mr. Mortimer O'Sullivan is decidedly hostile, and has taken an active Part in opposing the Proceedings of the National Board of Education in Ireland?

Upon the latter Part of the Question I should express great Doubts; that he is hostile to the Principle of the National Board I know; that he has taken an active Part against the Proceedings of the Board I do not know.

Not at public Meetings?

No, I am not aware of that; I have heard Mr. O'Sullivan frequently speak, but I am not sure that I have heard him advert, with One Exception only, to the National Board.

One of your Objects you have stated in visiting Ireland was to examine into the Nature and Progress of the System of National Education; did you visit the Model School at Dublin, the principal School under that System, during your Residence in Dublin?

I did not visit it.

Did the Archbishop of Dublin propose to you to visit the Model School?

He did; he was so good as to offer to accompany me to the Model School.

May the Committee ask why, it being your Object to make yourself acquainted with the Progress of the System, you did not avail yourself of the Offer so made?

They were chiefly domestic Reasons, arising from other Engagements in Dublin which would have rendered it difficult for me to go; but I cannot say that I felt any Curiosity to see the Model School. The Model School in Dublin, under the Eye of the Board itself, and enjoying the personal Inspection of the Archbishop of Dublin, I should have held to have been probably managed in a very superior Manner to that which would have been a fair Illustration of the System throughout the Country.

Should you not have considered the Model School as the Place best exhibiting the System that it was the Object of the National Board of Education to enforce as far as they had the Means throughout Ireland?

No; I think decidedly not; the Object being to convey popular Education to the uneducated and uncivilized Districts of Ireland, I should have greatly preferred to have seen a School in the County of Cork or the County of Donegal to have seen one in the Heart of Dublin; I should have held that the one afforded a fair Illustration of the natural working of the System, and the other was planted in the Hotbed of a very artificial Atmosphere, and where a very stringent Inspection could be used, which would make it very different from the ordinary Schools.

The Question applied not to the practical working of the System, but to an Exhibition of the Plan or System intended to be enforced and copied as far as with the Imperfection of Means it could be copied in other Places?

The Plan I thought I had pretty well ascertained from the Reports of the Board, and from the Statement of the System as it was originally laid down at its first Institution. The practical working was the Point upon which I felt the greatest Doubt, and it was to the practical working therefore that my Attention was specially directed.

During the whole of your Communication with the Archbishop of Dublin did you state any Facts whatever as having reached your Knowledge of an unfavourable Tendency with regard to the Operation of the Schools?

My Communications with the Archbishop of Dublin were confined to One Evening in his own House; and with the Exception that the Subject was mentioned, and that I was not able to agree with the Archbishop upon the Principles of the Board, I did not advert to any Facts.

Should

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Should you have thought yourself justified upon such an Occasion, upon a casual Visit to his Grace, to have taken an Opportunity of entering upon the Subject of Complaints with regard to the Schools of which you had heard?
Certainly not.

Had you known the Archbishop long?
I had the Benefit of the Archbishop's Assistance whilst I was at Oxford.

Those Words which you have put down, "bad Character," were not the Words in the original Notes you took?
No; they were the Substance of the Impression that Mr. Price's Conversation led me to make.

The original Words were "a great Blackguard"?
I should not like to say that Mr. Price used those Words.

Were those the Words that you put down in your original Note?
Yes.

You are not sure that they were the Words used by Mr. Price?
I am not sure; I would not charge Mr. Price with using them.

Are you positive that he used the Word Ribbonman?
I am not confident; but I have an Impression that something was said of Ribbonmen, and I do not know how that could be in my Mind except from this Conversation with Mr. Price.

That he was a Leader of Ribbonmen?
I cannot say whether the Expression was a Leader of Ribbonmen or a Ribbonman, or connected with Ribbonmen.

Or a Brother of Ribbonmen?
No.

Could the Words used have been Blackfeet or Whitefeet?
No, certainly not.

Have you heard that there was an Association in Ireland called Ribbonmen some Years before?
Yes.

Have you ever heard that of those the most leading Persons were Village Schoolmasters?
I have heard so.

You stated in a former Answer that you were led to form an Opinion that the Board could not exercise a proper Control over their Schools by some Circumstances that Mr. Price stated to you in the course of the Conversation that took place on the Steam Boat relating to a School on Lord Lansdowne's Estate; will you be so good as to state those Circumstances?
"Mr. Price stated, that, as Agent of Lord Lansdowne, he gave Support or Countenance to Four or Five National Schools, and therefore might be considered as very friendly to the System; that he went lately into one at Shangannaghmore; the Master was not come nor the Mistress, but the Daughter said the Mistress was coming. There were no Scripture Extracts in the Hands of the Children, but Five Copies of Butler's Catechism, in which the Children were preparing themselves for Confirmation. Mr. Price wrote this to the Board; the Board, as he understood, stated it to the Priest, who declared that no School was held that Day. The Board had no further Communication with Mr. Price, but fined the Master One Pound. All Communications as to Schools on Lord Lansdowne's Estate are sent to the Priest, and not to Mr. Price, of which Mr. Price complained."

That you consider to have been Mr. Price's Statement to you?
That is the Statement which I took down in the same Way that I did the other, in Pencil, at the Time Mr. Price was speaking.

That Statement, so collected in Conversation, was sufficient to induce you to form the Opinion that the Board were so incompetent to enforce their own

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Rules in the Schools under their Direction, as to render it useless to make any Communication to them with that View?

That Statement was by no means sufficient if it stood alone, but the Statement was to my Mind a strong Illustration of the Views which I had myself been induced to form from various othe Facts, and that Statement which I here give as an Illustration was to my Mind Confirmation of the Views which I previously held.

Then, considering that to have been One of the Facts which induced you to come to that Conclusion, but only One, will you be so good as to state the other Facts upon which you form that Conclusion?

To answer that Question I must go into a very long Statement of Facts and Arguments.

The Question is confined to Facts?

I do not see that I could do Justice to my Answer without entering into a very long Statement of my Views as well as of Facts.

Will you enter into that Statement, observing that the Question put to you is as to the Facts upon which you founded the Conclusion to which you have come?

I can state some Facts, allowing it to be understood that those Facts by no means represent the whole Reasons which weighed upon my Mind. I found, in my Examination of the Schools in Ulster, that it generally depended upon the Patrons of the School what the Character of the School was, and that the Observance of the Rules of the Board depended in like Manner upon the Patrons and the Masters of the Schools. For example, I found, where the Patrons of the Schools were Presbyterians, there the Scripture Extracts were in use, but where the Patrons were Roman Catholics, I did not find the Scripture Extracts to be in the same Use. I found Two Schools in Armagh, One of them the Charlamont National School. I found there a Master, a Scotchman, a Mr. Johnston, selected by the Rev. Mr. Henry, who, I believe, is a Presbyterian, or at all events a Protestant Clergyman, and in that School I found not only the Scripture Extracts, but I found, as I should have found in a School in Scotland, the Bible in the Hands of the Children, though it was then Eleven o'clock in the Forenoon, and upon observing that it was scarcely regular it was admitted to me that it was not regular. On the other hand, I visited the Armagh National School, close to the Roman Catholic Church of Dr. Crolly. I saw, of course, there no Bible, and I was merely told that they used the Scripture Extracts; but upon Inquiry of the Master I was told by him that whilst he was Master of the Market Hill National School he made the Children read the Bible, he being then under the Patronage of a Presbyterian Minister, and it being esteemed desirable to conciliate the Presbyterians. I was informed that in the Parish of Derryloran, near Cook's Town, that the Scripture Extracts were not formerly used in the School, not till a very recent Time, because the Children thought it a Loss of Time to read them. That School was under the Patronage of a Roman Catholic Priest and Two Roman Catholic Laymen. In the Belfast National Schools I was informed that on the Books of one there were a Thousand Children, only Nine of whom were Protestants, while at the Frederick Street National School in the same Town out of 850 Children there were 250 Roman Catholics; and in that, being under the Superintendence of an active Scotch Schoolmaster, I found that the Bible or the Scripture Extracts, I am not sure which, were read from Two to Three o'Clock every Day. I was informed further, that in the National School near New Mills, which is managed by Presbyterians, the Bible is read, and that all the Books of the Board were put away in the Drawer, locked up, and not used. I further heard of Ten Schools in One Rural Deanery, and those Schools being under the Management of Roman Catholic Patrons or Priests, in none of them the Scripture Lessons were read; and on the other hand I heard of Ten Schools in another Rural Deanery in which the Bible was read, those Schools being under the Management of Presbyterian Patrons or Clergymen. It was from these Facts, and such as these, that I came to my Conclusion. Mr. Price stated, with regard to a National School at Balliboy, King's County, he found the Scripture Extracts covered with Dust, and never used.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Do you know who is the Patron?
I understand from Mr. Price that it is a Roman Catholic.

Did you understand from Mr. Price that it is on the Noble Marquis's Estate?
No, I have no Note of that Kind; he found, as I understood him, the same in some National Schools in the County of Galway.

Did Mr. Price express to you any Opinion of the general System of the Board?
At the School last mentioned, at Balliboy, Mr. Price said there were no Protestant Children, and he thought it no Wonder; he thinks the Schools unfit for Protestant Children; the Scheme is quite a Failure on this Side,—that is, on the Side of the Protestant Part of the Population.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 14° *Aprilis* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Have you any Papers to deliver in, in addition to those which you produced before?

I have brought a Minute of the 10th of October 1833, of which I have received a Copy since I was last examined.

The same is delivered in, and read, and is as follows:

"Minute, 10th October 1833.

"Present: — Archbishop of Dublin, Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Rev. James Carlile.

"The Order of the 4th of July, suspending the Salary of the Teacher of the Erril N. School until Report be made, having been read, and the Report of the Inspector, of the 28th of September, considered;

"It was resolved, That this Order be now rescinded, and that the Salary and all Arrears due be paid to the Teacher."

Have you also some other Letters to deliver in?

I have.

Of what Dates are those Letters?

The Letters are, — a Letter from Mr. Price to me, dated 16th of June in the Year 1833; a Letter of Mr. Tracy to me, of the 7th October in the same Year; a Letter of Mr. Tracy to me, of the 7th October in the Year 1834; a Letter of Mr. Tracy to me, of the 14th January 1836; a Letter of Mr. Price to me, of 27th July 1836.

The Witness delivers in the same, which are read, and are as follow:

"Sir, Westfield Farm, 16th June 1833.

"In your Letter of the 7th December last you distinctly state, 'that the Grant is in every Case forfeitable unless the School be found on Inspection to be fully supplied with all School Requisites, and the Conditions as subscribed to be strictly observed.'

"As the School has not as yet been furnished with any School Requisites, or the Books authorized to be used by the National School Society, and as the Master has neglected to class the Children, or to avail himself of the Forms and Regulations prescribed by the Model School in Kildare Place, which merely tend to insure Order, or indeed to adopt any modern System of Education, I conceived I would have lent myself to an Imposition on the Society had I under such Circumstances applied for the Salary, or certified for the Conduct and Capabilities of the Master.

"I have only lately been able to procure a Person to contract to put up the Forms and Desks, and to make other necessary Alterations and Repairs in the Schoolroom, the Sum of 15*l.* granted by the Society for those Purposes being quite inadequate to the due or decent Performance of the Work required to be done.

"I believe there is very little Expectation of our being able to procure any additional Funds from Subscriptions; and unless the Society will make a free Grant of the necessary School Requisites I fear the School may remain some Time longer without them.

"I remain, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. R. PRICE."

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

"Sir, Barry Hill, Rathdowney, 7th October 1833.

"In accordance with the Regulations of the Board I request that you will have the goodness to have an Order made for Payment of the Salary which is being due for some Time to Mr. William White, Teacher in the Erril National School; he has not received any thing in the way of Compensation since he entered on the School, which was last September 1832. By a Reference to your Papers you will of course learn that this School has been visited by one of the Inspectors, and you will also, I trust, learn that his Report is satisfactory, so that there will be no Difficulty to be presumed in making the Order for Payment to this Teacher, who is, to my Knowledge, most attentive and industrious in the Discharge of his Duties. I must also express a Hope that the Salary may be forwarded to me as soon as possible. There is now due to him Payment for One Year.

"I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
Wm. Tracy."

"There is required at present for the School Three Dozen of Spelling Books, Nos. 1, 2, and 3.; Three Dozen Slates; One Ream Paper.
"W. T."

"Sir, Barry Hill, Rathdowney, 7th October 1834.

"I beg to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of the 19th Ult., which should have received an earlier Answer but for my Absence from Home. On the other Side you have a List of the Books wanting for the Erril National School.

"The Teacher's Half Year's Salary became due on the 30th of September; he has asked me to apply to you for it, and I will thank you to let me have it at your Convenience.

"I shall not fail to give my Attention, as you desire, to the general Rules of the Board, and to be careful that no Sectarian Books shall be introduced into the School.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your faithful Servant,
Wm. Tracy."

"Books, &c. for the Erril National School.

"One Dozen Books, No. 1.
"One Dozen — No. 2.
"Half Dozen — No. 3.
"Two Reams of Paper.
"Four Rolls.
"Half Dozen Slates.
"W. T."

"Sir, Barry Hill, Rathdowney, 14th January 1836.

"Mr. Price has forwarded me a Letter addressed by you to him relative to the Erril School. The Inspector's Report has been, it appears, this Time unfavourable to the Teacher, and the Commissioners in consequence call for his Removal. The Object of us all is to have the School conducted as efficiently as possible, and from my Knowledge of our local Circumstances I feel justified in declaring, as the Acting Manager of that School, and as the Individual who has taken the most decided Interest in its Success, that his Removal at the present Moment would be injurious to its best Interests. I may remark that the Moment the Inspector arrived was an unfavourable one, as any Person acquainted with the Country must know that it would be impossible to secure a full Attendance at the Approach of Christmas, particularly in this poor Country, where they are so badly provided against the Inclemency of the Season. In consequence he only met (it being also Dinner Hour) with the youngest Portion of the Children and the least instructed.

"What I would propose for the Consideration of the Board just now is, that the Master be continued for the present, and I think when the Inspector next visits the School he will find it efficiently conducted. The Master is well acquainted with the Country, and Numbers therefore attend that otherwise would

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

would not. I shall myself make it a point to visit the School very frequently, and see that it shall be regularly attended to. When this is recollected, and the Length of the Time the Teacher has been in connexion with the Board, I think you will agree with me that it will be better to continue him for the present; indeed I do not know how his Place could just now be supplied; and I am myself the only Person in this immediate Neighbourhood who would take any Interest in the Success of the National Schools, which I owe to myself to add is my only Motive in making this Communication.

"I remain, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
WM. TRACY."

"Sir, Westfield Farm, 27th July 1836.

"I have received your Letter of the 27th of May, which has, from various Causes, remained unanswered thus long; but, in particular, I did not, I must confess, expect to be applied to for any Information relative to the Conduct pursued by the Master in Erril School, as my Opinions relative to his Unfitness for the Situation could not have been unknown to you. I also considered the Revocation of the Commissioners Order, which was communicated to me in your Letter of the 16th of December last, for his Removal from the School for Negligence and Incompetency, without any Reference or Communication to me on the Subject, a Proceeding calculated to convince me that I was not looked upon by the Commissioners as the Person whose Opinion carried the greatest Weight with them.

"I therefore must take leave to refer you to the Reverend William Tracy for the Explanation you require.

"I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. ROBINSON PRICE."

With those Papers have you given in all the Minutes of the Board respecting the Erril Case?

I have.

Was your Letter to Mr. Tracy, Letter B., written by Direction of the Commissioners?

It was written under the general Directions and Instructions which I have ever received as Secretary.

Then all the Letters which you have produced, for which there are no special Minutes, were written under your general Instructions?

Yes.

Does it appear upon the Face of the Letter whether the Letter was written under your general Instructions, or under a particular Order and Direction from the Board?

No; you could not gather that from the Letter itself. I have adopted One official Style in all Letters, whether written under my general Instructions or by a special Minute of the Board.

In your former Evidence you referred to a Letter of Mr. Tracy's of the 14th of July, to which your Letter of the 27th of July purports to be a Reply; can you state where that Letter is?

I must ask your Lordship's Indulgence to search for it.

Also, in your Letter to Mr. Tracy of the 21st of October 1836 you refer to a Letter of the 8th of October 1836; where is that Letter?

I see that I have not delivered in that Letter. It must be through Inadvertence that that Letter has not been forwarded to me from my Office, to enable me to produce it; but I will cause immediate Search for it, and send it to your Lordships.

Are those Letters in Town?

I cannot say. A Second Parcel of those Letters arrived this Morning. The Mail due To-day had not arrived when I came out.

So that at present you cannot state what there may be in the Parcel?

I cannot.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

The Committee understand that you are desirous of making some Explanation as to your Answer relating to the Dingle School?

I am. The Explanation I wish to give is this; that the Board took a Lease of the School Premises in that Case. The Grant made by them was 45*l.*, and the local Contribution was a very small Sum, about 10*l.* or 11*l.* The Fact was not so fully upon my Mind when I was asked on a former Day to account for the Board's Grant being so much beyond the Proportion of the local Contribution.

Did you also take a Lease in the Case of the Caherciveen School?

Yes; I so stated at the Time when that Question was asked me.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

John Price, Esq.

JOHN PRICE Esquire is again called in, and further examined as follows:

The Committee understand that you are desirous of offering some Explanation with respect to an Answer which you gave, under Misapprehension, to a Question which was put to you, whether Lord Lansdowne had any School under the Board in the Queen's County?

Yes. I inadvertently stated that he had not; in consequence, I presume, of the School of Shangannaghmoor being in the Parish of Athy, which is in the County of Kildare, though Shangannaghmoor is in the Queen's County. I had some confused Idea as to Shangannaghmoor, which is in another Diocese, and in the Parish of Athy. That, I suppose, was the Reason of my Mistake.

You had it in fact, then, upon your Mind, that the Question applied to a Property of Lord Lansdowne's which is nearer to the Ladies Fitzpatrick's?

Yes; I supposed that that was the School alluded to.

Was there not formerly a School of Lord Lansdowne's upon a Property which he has parted with, called Morett, not under the National Board, but under the Kildare Place Society?

There was.

Was not that, at the Time it was Lord Lansdowne's Property, subject to your Inspection?

It was.

During the Time that it was subject to your Inspection did not the Numbers attending that School very much fall off?

They did, at the latter End of 1829.

To what do you attribute their having so fallen off?

I think, generally speaking, to a well founded Suspicion that the Catholic Clergy entertained, that the Kildare Place Society was a proselyting Society. I think it was that which was the Cause. I remember particularly well the Reverend Mr. O'Connor calling upon me to subscribe to a School on the great Heath of Maryborough. There was a Stand-house there for public Races, which had been then given up. It was within a Mile of the Morett School. I stated that I did not think it was necessary to subscribe to that School on the Part of Lord Lansdowne, because his Lordship had already one at Morett, which was quite sufficient for all the Purposes that were required for that Estate. He said that he did not think his Lordship ought to continue to encourage that School or System, and that for his Part he would withdraw the Children of his Flock from it.

You understood his Reason to be, that he considered the Kildare Place Society to be one that interfered with the Religion of the Children?

Yes.

With regard to the School of Shangannaghmoor, do you remember having made any Mention of the School at Shangannaghmoor in an incidental Conversation which you are stated to have had with a Gentleman on the Subject of Schools, on the Deck of a Steam Packet, coming from Scotland?

I cannot accurately state the very Words, but I have a full and accurate Impression upon my Mind of the general Conversation, not only about Scotch Schools but Irish Schools. It was on my Return from Scotland, when I was

full

John Price, Esq.

full of Admiration of the System of Education which I had witnessed at Deanston Farm, in a School under the Direction of Mr. Smith. I stated, as amongst the Abuses that had crept into the National Schools, what I had witnessed in a School some Time, I think, in August or September, where I found Thirty-two Children present, and the Master and Mistress absent, but that I found the Daughter of the Mistress at the ordinary Business of the School, teaching a Class, and I asked where the Master was. I do not say that I told all this to Mr. Colquhoun, but this was what I detected in the School; and I told him I found Five Catholic Catechisms, and that was a Violation of the Rules of the Society, and that I reported it to the Board.

You mentioned more or less of this to Mr. Colquhoun, though probably not the whole?

Perhaps not the whole, but that was what I might have mentioned.

At that Time you were returning to Ireland, after some Absence from it. Previous to your having gone to Scotland you had made a Representation to that Effect to the Board; and did you, upon your Return, find an Answer from the Board to your Representation?

Yes; I have it in my Pocket.

Was that Answer satisfactory to you?

It was, quite so. The Board answered my first Complaint by thanking me for having reported that Violation to them, stating that they had fined the Master 1*l.* Upon my Return I received another Letter, stating that the Fine was inflicted under a Mistake, and stating that they had received Information that it was an admitted and known Vacation, and that the Fine was rescinded, and that Mr. Kelly was desired to communicate that to me.

And you were satisfied that, notwithstanding your original Apprehension that it was an ordinary Period of School Attendance, it was in fact a Period of Vacation?

I take for granted that it was, though the Girl teaching a Class in the School led me to believe that the ordinary Business of the School was going on.

But you have no Doubt that the Board made Inquiry upon the Subject in consequence of your Representation?

I have no Doubt of it. I was going through Dublin, and I called at the Model School. I saw Mr. Kelly. Mrs. Price was with me at the Time. We went to see the Model School. Mr. Kelly told me, on my Way going, that he understood I was wrong; and on my Return back I received a Letter, which, if your Lordships wish, I can produce.

With respect to your Visit to the School, did you not find the School full of Children?

Thirty-two only.

And you found a Girl teaching them?

I found a Girl teaching a Class.

How many would there have been if the whole School had been present?

I dare say Eighty or Ninety. I have been at the School since, and found Treble the Number that were there on that Occasion.

Is it usual for a considerable Number of Children to attend during a known Period of Vacation?

I never happened to go into that School during a Vacation before.

Do you know any School where it is usual for the Children to attend during a known Period of Vacation?

I do not; but the Girl told me in the School that the Master was gone to a Confirmation which the Bishop was to hold in Athy.

The Girl did not tell you that it was a Day of Vacation?

She did not.

Did you conceive yourself that it was a Day of Vacation?

I did not.

John Price, Esq.

What was the Time of the Year?
September. The Grounds of my Belief proceeded from seeing the Girl examining a Class in the School in the ordinary Way, and I went to that Class to see what was going on.

Was the Girl the Daughter of the Master and Mistress?
The Daughter of the Mistress; not of the Master. They were separate Persons.

You did not complain to Mr. Colquhoun, on board the Steam Packet, that the Board had taken no Sort of Notice of your Letter?
No, certainly not. I stated it as one of the Abuses of the System. I never could have had such an Impression upon my Mind. The Impression upon my Mind, in my Conversation with Mr. Colquhoun, was as to the Incompetency of the Masters, whom I compared with the Scotch Masters, regretting that ours were so very inferior. I was in Communication with Mr. Stowe of Glasgow about Masters at the Time, to get one from his Model School for the School in Castleton in the Queen's County.

In that Conversation between you and the Gentleman upon the Deck of the Steam Packet, upon the Subject of Irish and Scotch Schools, did you make any Mention of the Model School at Dublin?
I did, I am sure, because I had been at the Model School, and I was quite pleased with the Prospect that we were to have the same System in Operation, from Mr. M'Arthur being at the Head of it, who is a Scotchman, I believe. I had no Doubt that in a few Years at least the Imperfections of the Masters would be removed.

That they would be removed by means of the Model School when it got into full Operation?
By means of the Model School.

Have you since the Period to which you alluded had Occasion to visit the School upon Lord Lansdowne's Estate at Shangannaghmoor?
I have.

In what Condition have you found that School since?
I have found it in perfect Order; I found the Master and Mistress attending, and the Children employed in Work of general Excellence. I went in unexpectedly, and I saw the Scripture Extracts in their Hands, and I met Mr. Lawlor, the Priest, in the School. He could not have known that I was going into that Country at that Time.

Do you remember, in that Conversation which has been so frequently referred to, mentioning to the Gentleman any other School besides Shangannaghmoor on Lord Lansdowne's Estate, beginning with the same Letter?
No; there is no other School beginning with the same Letter.

You say you found the Priest at the Time when you went in?
I did.

Was he examining the Children?
I cannot say he was.

Are there many Protestant Children in the School?
I should say not.

You do not know?
No; I think there are not; I do not think there are any in the immediate Neighbourhood of the School; I know there are none on Lord Lansdowne's Estate thereabouts.

You say that upon your former Visit you were told that the Master was gone to a Confirmation; was it a Protestant Confirmation or a Roman Catholic?
It was a Roman Catholic. Archbishop Murray was confirming at the Time; it was his Diocese, and that perhaps led to my Inaccuracy upon Tuesday as to the School not being in the Queen's County.

Is there not another School upon Lord Lansdowne's Property in the Queen's County, though not in connexion with the National Board?
There are Two, one in connexion with the Established Church, to which

John Price, Esq.

Lord Lansdowne subscribes, purely parochial, and another in Luggacurran, which I have applied to have placed under the National Board, but which has not yet been taken into connexion with it.

Is not the Reason that it is not in connexion with the Board, that the Board has not been able hitherto to admit it into connexion?
That is the Answer that I have received, though I have repeatedly complained of its not being taken into connexion.

Do any Catholics attend that School which is purely parochial?
Several.

And that is not under the Board?
It is not.

Is it under any Society?
It is under no Society; it was formerly under the London Hibernian Society.

The Master of course is a Protestant?
He is.

Is there any Objection made on the Part of the Priests in that District to the Roman Catholic Children attending the School?
I am not aware that there is; there are not a great many Children in it; it has not been supplied properly with Books.

But you say the greater Proportion are Catholic?
There are not more than Three or Four Protestant Families in the Parish.

When you saw Mr. Colquhoun, did you state to him, that you conceived the System of Education a Failure, as respected the Protestants?
I cannot say, and I do not believe that I made use of that Phrase; I stated to him that I visited a School of Lord Lansdowne's in the King's County, which is under my Care, at Ballyboy; that I went into that School, as I always do whenever I go upon other Business,—I make it a Rule to visit the Schools if I have Time;—I asked the Master, had he been supplied with the Scripture Lessons? he said he had. I asked him if he used them? he said not. I asked him where they were? he said they were locked up. I asked him why he did not read them? he said he did not know. I continued still to ask him, did any one prevent him? he said not. Then I stated, and stated on the Book, that I would report the Transaction to the Board, and I did report it. I went on to ask, were there any Protestants in the School? and he said there were not. I I said then, "Your keeping the Scriptures locked up is a sufficient Reason to keep the Protestants away." I think I stated this to Mr. Colquhoun, but I do not recollect stating any thing like a general or a sweeping Censure of the System as a Failure. I stated that Fact.

Having made this Entry in the Book, was any Notice taken of what had passed by the Board?
Yes. I had been twice in the King's County since, and I visited the School; and I also met with the Reverend Mr. Lynch, who told me that what I complained of had been remedied; that the Board had written down that it was optional with the Schoolmaster or with the Patrons, either to read the Scripture Extracts, or not to read them; that it was one of the Regulations to have it optional. I went to the School twice since, and I saw the Scripture Extracts being read, and in the Hands of the Children.

Was the Reverend Mr. Lynch a Catholic or a Protestant?
A Catholic.

Have you any Doubt that the Scripture Extracts are now used in that School?
I have not the slightest Doubt but that they are.

By the same Master?
By the same Master.

John Price, Esq.

Would it not have been the Duty of the Inspector, when he made a Visit, to have noticed such a Fact, and to have reported it, if they had continued to neglect the Use of the Scripture Extracts?

It would have been his Duty, I conclude, but I was told by the Master that the Inspector did go there, and, having read my Observations, he said that they looked like an Attack upon the System.

Do you know the Name of that Inspector?

I do not know the Name; I was determined to report that also.

Whom did you hear that from?

From the Master of the School, I believe, or from the Reverend Mr. Lynch. I wrote a strong Comment on the Neglect of reading the Scripture Extracts.

When you made this Entry did you at that Time suppose it to be the Rule of the Board to make the reading of the Scripture Extracts imperative?

I was under that Impression, and that was the Reason that I made the Complaint. I was not aware that there was a discretionary Power.

Are the Disturbers of the Peace in the Queen's County denominated Ribbonmen?

No, they are not.

Did you tell Mr. Colquhoun on board the Packet that the Master of the Erril School was a Ribbonman?

I certainly did not, because it is a Phrase that could not come across my Mind.

Did you tell Mr. Colquhoun that the Master of the Erril School was connected with Ribbonmen?

Certainly not. Ribbonmen do not exist in the Queen's County, and again, I never thought that Master to be connected with Conspirators of any Kind.

Are you quite sure that you never mentioned the Word Ribbonmen in that Conversation?

I am quite satisfied I never did; if I had a Doubt upon my Mind about it, it would be removed from the Fact that there is not, neither has there been, a Conspiracy denominated Ribbonmen in the Queen's County.

Did you mention the Name of Whitefoot, or any other?

I do not think I did; it never was impressed upon my Mind that the Man was a Conspirator, or a Combinator of any Kind. I had a Knowledge of this Man from the Year 1822.

Is this Schoolmaster a Native of Queen's County?

He is a Native of that Place.

Have you never heard that Ribbonism was the general Appellation used with regard to all those who take illegal Oaths in the whole of Ireland?

I always thought that Ribbonism was a Conspiracy entered into to oppose Orangeism, and that wherever Orangeism existed in the greatest Force, there Ribbonism followed it. Whitefeet and Blackfeet was an Agrarian Conspiracy, which prevailed to a great Extent in the Queen's County; their Object was to resist the Change or the Regulation of Property, and against Tithes: that is my Definition of the Two Societies.

Are you a Magistrate?

I am.

You are quite sure that you did not mention this Man as being either a Whitefoot, or connected with Whitefeet, or any secret Association of any Kind?

I am as sure as I can be with respect to a casual loose Conversation; I placed no particular Guard on my Speech; but from the Impression upon my Mind, it never could or ought to have taken place.

You never suspected that he was a Conspirator of any Kind?

I never suspected that he was. I had no Secret to keep about that School or any other, and I could have no possible Reason to keep secret the Character

racter of the Master. I complained to the Board of the Transaction, and stated the exact State of the Case as it occurred to me at the Time. *John Price, Esq.*

What do you suppose has induced this Man White to conduct himself in the Way that he has done, so very ungratefully towards you?
I do not know any other Reason than that, as he has turned to tippling; perhaps (though my Disapprobation of him may have commenced long before) his Hostility to me may have commenced in consequence of my turning off his Brother from the Lady Fitzpatrick's Property.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend MARK PERRIN is called in, and examined as follows: *Rev. Mark Perrin.*

Are you a Clergyman?
I am.

Have you a Living in the Diocese of Kildare?
In the Diocese of Dublin, the Parish of Kilsallaghan.

Before you became Vicar of Kilsallaghan you were in the Queen's County?
I was.

What Parish were you in there?
Latterly I was not in any Clerical Employment, that is, during the last Two Years of my Residence in the Queen's County.

What Two Years were those?
The Years 1834 and 1835.

In 1834 were you residing near Mr. Price, who has just been here?
I was within about Seven Miles of him at Abbyleix.

You and he were intimate Friends?
Yes.

Do you recollect a remarkable Occurrence that befel him, of a threatening Notice that was put up in the Parish of Erril?
I have heard of it.

As a Friend of his did you go to see him upon the Occasion?
No, it was not upon that Occasion I went; I went, accompanied by Mrs. Perrin, to spend Two or Three Days at his House.

Was it soon after that?
I think it was about a Week or Ten Days after that.

He told you what had occurred?
He did.

What did he tell you?
He told me that a Goose had been hung up on a Gibbet upon some new Fencing that he was making upon the Estate of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, and a threatening Notice placed in the Bill of the Goose.

Did he show you the threatening Notice?
He did not.

Did he give you any Account of it?
I think he did.

Did he tell you any thing of the Paper on which it was written?
Yes, he said he thought it was like the Paper of the National School.

What did you remark upon that; any thing?
No.

Did you agree to go together to Erril?
We went upon the Monday following, not for the specific Purpose of visiting the Erril School, but to see an Improvement he was making upon that Estate.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

That was at Erril?
It was.

When at Erril did you go to the School?
We did.

Did you go with any particular Object to the School?
No, I do not think we did; after we had passed through the Village we were going on to a Farm that he held about Half a Mile beyond it, and when we were going by he said, come in and look at this School.

You went in together?
Yes.

Mr. Price, being asked, "Was it for the sake of inspecting its Condition as a School merely?" answered, "I think it was. Have you any Doubt of that?—I do not know," he answers; "perhaps it might be to ascertain the Similitude of the Writing, which we did not see; but it might be with some view of that kind, for it was so immediately after the Writing,—to ascertain the Similitude of the Writing that might have been there and the Writing that was on the Notice; I cannot say that it was so, for I really believe that we were merely passing by; he was anxious for my Safety, having heard of this Notice, and he came up and called to see how I was going on." Do you agree with him in thinking it probable that that was the Motive for your going into the School?
I recollect his saying, come in here, and see how this Fellow is going on.

Did he intimate to you that it had any Connexion with the threatening Notice?
No. This Man's Brother was one of the Persons who was about to lose some Land, and Mr. Price, from seeing the Notice or the Paper, had naturally some Suspicions of the Schoolmaster having supplied the Paper.

And therefore it was you conceive that he said come in and let us see what this Fellow is doing?
How the School is going on.

Your Phrase was "how this Fellow is going on"?
Yes.

You recollect those to have been his Words?
I cannot exactly recollect that those were the Words, but I think as well as I recollect they were.

You went into the School with him?
I did.

As you went in under the Suspicion that this Man had to do with that, and that you went in to see how he was going on, perhaps your Attention was a little directed to those Points in the School?
We only examined a Class of Spelling, for there was not a Class then in the School that could read.

Could any of them write?
There were some Copies there.

Did you look at those Copies?
We looked at Two or Three Copies.

Did you see any thing remarkable in those Copies?
No.

Did you look for the Purpose of seeing whether there was any thing remarkable?
No; they were very young Boys that were present; they seemed to be merely learning to write Strokes and Letters.

From the School where did you go?
We went on then to Mr. Price's Farm.

How far?
Upwards of Half a Mile; there we spent nearly an Hour.

Did

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Did you return to the School?
We returned.

What did you do?
We went into a House on the Ladies Fitzpatrick's Estate.

Was that the Cottage of Widow Kilfoyle?
It was.

What Sort of a Cottage was it?
A common Farm House.

Was there a numerous Family there
There was an old Woman, and Two or Three young Women, and a Man.

Any Boys there?
I did not see any Child there at all.

By Boys is meant from Ten to Twenty?
Not any.

You wanted Pen and Ink, did not you?
Mr. Price wanted a Pen and Ink and some Paper to write some Directions.

And you sent to the School for it?
They brought in Paper; I do not know whether they got it out of the School, or not.

Mr. Price says, "I believe she went to the School;" but wherever she went she brought back a Copy Book?
Yes.

The Copy Book that she brought back came from the School?
I am not aware of that.

What was done with the Copy Book when it was brought?
Mr. Price took a Piece of Paper out of it, to write upon, and I took the Copy Book to look over it.

Did you make any Observation when you looked over that Copy Book?
I found in the Centre of the Copy Book, among some blank Leaves, an Expression that I thought was a very objectionable one.

Do you recollect what were the Words?
The Words I do not exactly recollect; Mr. Price has reminded me it was a "Lamentation for the Boys who suffered the other Day at Maryborough." I thought it was "God be with the Boys;" and the Names of the Men were afterwards given.

Did you make any Remark to Mr. Price, before you looked into the Copy Book, respecting the Habit you had and the Purpose you had in examining such Books?
I do not think I did, but I think I remarked it to him when we were coming home in the Carriage.

Mr. Price has said that, before you discovered this, you said, "I always examine these Copy Books to see what the Sentiments are written at the Head, and it gives one a very good Opportunity of ascertaining what the Feelings of the Master are"?
I think that occurred in the Carriage going home. Mr. Price said, "How did you happen to look through the Copy Book?" and I mentioned the Circumstance to him, that I was in the Habit of looking through the Copy Books.

But you have stated that you did not know from whence that Copy Book came?
I did not know it.

What did Mr. Price do upon that?
I handed him the Copy Book; I said "Here is a curious Thing to be in this Book;" and he cut it out. He said, "I will send this up to the Board, and let them inquire about it."

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Are you confident that this Book was given to you merely in the Way of producing it as a Means from whence Mr. Price might supply himself with Paper?

Decidedly in no other Way; it was lying upon the Dresser or Table, and while he was writing I took it up, to employ the Time.

The Girl had brought it there, you knew not from whence, and she laid it upon the Table, and you took it up?

Yes; I thought the Book had been in the House, and that she did not go to the School for it.

Is that a Point upon which you can be mistaken?

I may be mistaken upon that, as the Thing occurred so long ago.

Upon this Mr. Price tore out the Leaf; and what did he do with it?

He put it into his Pocket Book.

Do you know that he wrote to the Board upon it?

I know nothing more about it of my own Knowledge; but I know that he wrote to the Board, for I spoke to him afterwards about it, and he told me that he had.

Did you ever see the Letter that was written by Mr. Price to the Board?

I am not quite sure whether Mr. Kelly showed it to me, or not.

You are sure that Mr. Price did not show it to you, but if you saw it, it was shown to you by Mr. Kelly?

Yes.

When?

Last July.

That is to say, a very considerable Time after the Circumstance had occurred?

Yes; Two Years or more after.

Did you understand it to be shown to you in consequence of the Notice that had been in the meantime publicly taken of the Circumstance?

Yes; but I am not sure that it was shown to me at all.

But if it was shown you it could only be in consequence of that?

Yes.

Will you refresh your Recollection by looking at the Letter?

[A Copy of the Letter is shown to the Witness.]

I do not recollect having seen that Letter before.

Does that Letter express your Feelings upon the Subject of the Transaction to which it refers?

I think there is an Inaccuracy in it with respect to looking over the Copies in the School; it was not in the School we found that Paper.

Has the Subject been a Matter of Conversation with you frequently?

Very frequently.

You have often talked of it?

Just at the Time I spoke of it.

Was your Report of it at the Time different from that which you have given To-day?

I do not think it was contradictory to what I have given To-day.

Can you mention any particular Persons to whom you have given an Account of this?

I recollect mentioning it to Mr. Yeilding; I did not recollect it till I met him in the Waiting-room here.

What Mr. Yeilding is that?

A Gentleman from Limerick.

A Man of Landed Property in the County of Limerick?

I believe so.

Have

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Have you been long acquainted with Mr. Yeilding?
Yes, I have known him some Time.

Were you on such Terms that you were likely to have a free Communication on rather a delicate Subject with him?
He was on a Visit at my House at the Time.

Were you connected at all with him?
Not at that Time in the same Way as I had been.

Have you been?
I have.

In what Way?
I have been connected in writing for a Newspaper for him.

Did he, with some others in that County, set up a Newspaper in Limerick?
He had a Newspaper in Limerick.

Did he engage you as Editor?
He did.

Without inquiring the Amount of your Salary as Editor, it was sufficient to induce a Connexion between you and him?
At that Time I was not the Editor; I had ceased to be the Editor.

When did you cease to be the Editor?
In the latter End of the Year 1833.

This Connexion had produced an Intimacy, and he had been staying in your House soon after this Transaction, and you talked to him about it?
I still continued to supply Articles to his Paper when I lived at Abbeyleix.

Is Mr. Yeilding at all concerned in writing for the Paper himself?
I do not think he wrote for it.

Are you aware whether he has written since for other Papers?
I think not.

Was he a Proprietor of it?
I believe he was a Proprietor of it; he was the only Man I knew in connexion with it.

Did you ever say this to Mr. Yeilding; that having seen a Notice, that is, the threatening Notice which has been spoken of, you said the Paper looked very like the ruled or official Paper issued to the National Education Schools, and that you asked Mr. Price if there was such a School in the Neighbourhood of the suspended Goose?
I did not; for I had never seen any of the Paper of the National Board in my Life before I went into that School; it was the first of the Schools I had ever been in.

You did not then know it to be the National School Paper?
I did not; nor did I ever see the Notice.

Did you say, that, as a Clergyman, you went to visit and inspect the School and examine the Copy Books?
I did not.

Though you did not say that you went to do that, you did, in point of fact, when you went into the School, examine the Copy Books?
I looked at Two or Three that were lying open; I did not examine them. They were the Copy Books of little Children that were drawing Strokes, and learning their first Letters.

Did you see a Child in that School who was capable of writing the objectionable Passage?
I should think not; for One of the Classes, the most advanced Class then present in the School, were called up to us, and they could not read.

Did you tell Mr. Yeilding at any Time, that when you were in the School some Comparison was made, either by Memory or by the Production of the

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Notice, with the Handwriting of the Master, on which some Handwriting of his was found similar, though disguised?

No, I did not. I never could have told Mr. Yeilding any thing of the Sort.

Did you enjoin Mr. Yeilding to Secrecy?

I did not think it at all necessary to enjoin him to Secrecy, a Man partaking of the Hospitality of my House. I was speaking incautiously and unreservedly to a Gentleman in my own House.

Did you, in fact, enjoin him to Secrecy?

I do not think I did. It was a Kind of casual careless Conversation; and I thought nothing of it. I might have done so; but I do not recollect it.

Did you attach any great Importance to it; or did you make him suppose that you wished Secrecy to be observed?

No; I had not the slightest Feeling of the Kind.

What was the Point upon which you would have wished him to be quiescent if you had enjoined Secrecy?

I did not tell him any thing that I would care to have told at the Market Cross.

When was your Attention first called to the Circumstances of this Case again?

When I saw it reported in the Newspaper as having been mentioned in the House of Lords.

Did you mention it to anybody in Dublin in consequence of that?

I went to Mr. Kelly as soon as I saw the Statement in the Standard, saying that I was the Person who had witnessed the Transaction; and I asked him to show me the original Paper that had been sent up, that I might answer the Standard; and I then wrote a Letter to the Standard.

Was it inserted in that Paper?

No, it was not.

Are you aware why it was not inserted?

There was a Notice in the Standard, stating that they had received my Letter, and that they would publish it in a Day or Two, but that they must in the meantime communicate with some Person; but that it was fair for them to state that I said that the Statement was incorrect and exaggerated.

But, in point of fact, your Letter never was published?

No.

Was any subsequent Reason given, either in the Paper or to you, for not publishing it?

There was no Reason given to me, but there was in the Paper.

What Reason was given in the Paper?

That they had communicated my Letter to their Informant; and that on his Answer it was evident that I must be guilty of wilful Falsehood, if Falsehood at all, and that they wished to spare my Feelings, or something to that Effect, out of respect to my Brother.

You said that you went to the Board and asked Mr. Kelly to show you the original Document. Did he show you the original Document?

He did not. He hunted through his Papers, and it was upon that Occasion that I do not know whether Mr. Price's Lettter was produced or not; but he produced Mr. Treacy's Letter, with a Pin Mark where the Document had been pinned, but he could not find the original Communication.

Were those Observations which you state to have been made by the Editor of the Standard put in Print, or in private to yourself?

In print.

Did you, in consequence of that, take any other Course to vindicate your Character?

No, that was after this Committee had been appointed, and I did not think I had any Right to take any public Notice of it till I had been examined.

But

But you never gave the Editor of that Newspaper, directly or indirectly, any Reason to believe that you had altered your Mind as to wishing that Statement to be published?
No, I did not.

That last Explanation on the Part of the Standard appeared after this Committee had been appointed?
Yes; and after it had been stated that I should be examined.

But in the meanwhile no Explanation has appeared?
No Explanation.

Have you got the Letter you wrote to the Standard?
I have not; I kept no Copy of it.

After what Interval from the Time when you wrote to the Standard did that Paragraph appear?
I wrote to the Standard in July, and that Paragraph appeared since the Commencement of this Session of Parliament, immediately after the Debate on the Appointment of this Committee.

Did you state to the Commissioners of Education in Dublin that you had done so?
I got a Letter from Mr. Price a Day or Two after I had written to the Standard, saying that he had seen the Bishop of Exeter's Speech published, in which the Statement with respect to that School was repeated; and that he really thought it was necessary that we should now publish an authorized Contradiction of it, and asking my Opinion whether we should draw up a joint Contradiction of it or not. He requested of me, if I saw no Objection, to draw it up; and I thought it my Duty to wait upon the Archbishop of Dublin, and mention the Circumstance to him; he advised me not to do so; and that was the only Conversation I ever had with any Commissioner about it.

Have you been much in the habit of conversing with the Peasantry of Ireland of the Roman Catholic Persuasion?
A good deal.

Do you ever hear a Roman Catholic Peasant talk of a Person lately deceased, without his accompanying it with a Supplication for Mercy on his Soul?
Very seldom; "God be good to him," or something of that Kind.

Do you suppose that a Sentence of Death is ever passed upon a Criminal, without a Judge concluding such a Sentence with such a Supplication?
I have not heard Sentence of Death often passed, but never without that.

If, in Conversation, any Roman Catholic Peasant was to utter such a Supplication, would you suppose that that Man favoured the Guilt of the deceased Criminal?
No, unless I had other Reason to think that was the Case.

If you were the Clergyman of a Parish, and kept a School, and had a Roman Catholic Teacher in that School, would you consider such an Observation uttered by that Roman Catholic Teacher as calling for Reproof?
No, I do not think I should.

If you had kept a School in the Way suggested, or had a School under your Patronage, in the Neighbourhood of a Place where several Persons had been hanged for Murder, and if the Schoolmaster of that School had given as a Heading of a Copy for the Boys to write, "The Lament for the Boys that were hanged at Maryborough," should you have thought that a right Thing, or not?
I should have thought it a very bad Thing.

Is that what you understand this Case to be?
No, certainly not.

What do you understand this Case to be?
By comparing the Handwriting it was evidently the Handwriting of the Boy who had written the Copies in the Book, so that I could not suppose the Master had written it, nor had it the Appearance of it.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

There were many other Copies in the Book?

There were several Copies in the Book; it was a very thick Book, containing, I dare say, a Quire of Paper.

Then you would have thought it a very exaggerated and incorrect Statement to have called that a Head Line for a Foot Copy?

Indeed I would.

You would have thought it a very incorrect and exaggerated Mode of dealing with it, to say that such Sentiments in any School would be sufficient Evidence of the Morals which were inculcated in it, but that they should have been permitted in a National School is quite too bad. Should you think that would have been an exaggerated and incorrect Representation of what you saw?

I do not think that is the Representation exactly of it; I should have considered these Words rather a Suggestion for Inquiry as to whether it had been so in fact.

Supposing it were written thus: that a Person had found in the National School the Words that have now been mentioned, "Lament for the Boys that were hanged at Maryborough," a very demoralizing Piece of Writing as a Heading for a Foot Copy, and that such Sentiments in any School would be sufficient Evidence of the Morals which were inculcated in it, but that they should have been permitted in a National School is quite too bad. Should you have thought that, if it had been applied to what you saw in this Book, and which was torn out by Mr. Price, an incorrect and exaggerated Representation?

If I believed that to be the Heading, and that I had known it to be the Handwriting of the Master, I should not have thought it incorrect.

The Question is, whether that appears to you to be an exaggerated and incorrect Statement as applied to the Fact as it presented itself to your Observation in that Widow's Cottage?

I think that Letter of Mr. Price's seems a very hurried Letter; he evidently wrote it in haste.

The Question is, whether that Statement, hurried or not, would have been an incorrect and exaggerated Representation of what you saw in that Cottage?

I think that is an incorrect Statement of it. Certainly, if that is a Statement it is an incorrect Statement.

Is it exaggerated?

It is if it states that it was a Heading for a Copy. I think it was not a Heading for a Copy.

You found your Opinion of its Exaggeration upon the Circumstance of your being convinced, upon the whole, in your Mind, that it was not the Heading of a Copy?

Precisely.

Is it also inaccurate in stating it to be found in the National School, when you stated you found it in a Cottage?

It is inaccurate.

Do not you make that Statement under the Impression that the Book was not, to your Knowledge, brought from the School to the House where it was found?

Indeed I think, whether it was or not, that Statement is incorrect, from the Evidence that I had that it was in the Handwriting of the Boy, and from the Appearance of it; it had not the Appearance at all of the Heading of a Copy. I think there were Two Lines of it; the first Line was in a large Hand, and the Name of the Individuals in a smaller Hand, as well as my Recollection serves.

But you do not think that it was in the Handwriting of the Master?

I am quite convinced of it. I compared it with the Handwriting of the Boy in his Copy. I looked through the Copies.

And you are convinced it was the Handwriting of the Boy?

Quite convinced of it.

Did

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Did not you think much more of this Circumstance than you otherwise should have done, in consequence of the threatening Notice that had been hung up against Mr. Price a few Days before?

I did; that was the principal Reason I pointed Mr. Price's Attention to it.

And if it had not been for that you would have thought very little of it?

I thought it showed a Sympathy with those Feelings which were expressed in the threatening Notice.

If the Girl had not brought this Copy Book into the Widow's Cottage for the Purpose of supplying Mr. Price with Paper, where do you suppose that it came from?

I did not see it brought into the Cottage; I thought the Copy Book had been lying in the Cottage from the Saturday Night preceding. This was on the Monday.

You have been asked whether you did not say, on discovering this, "I always examine these Copy Books, to see what Sentiments are written at the Head, and it gives me a very good Opportunity of ascertaining what the Feelings of the Masters are." You said that that was in the course of your travelling with Mr. Price?

To the best of my Recollection it was then. Mr. Price said, "it was very sharp of you to find it out;" and I said, I always looked through them very carefully.

Did it occur to you that the Circumstance of finding this in the Book in the Handwriting of the Boy gave you an Insight into the Character of the Master?

Not at all. I was speaking of the Headings I had seen frequently in Copy Books in Schools.

Was it not improbable that it should be written by the Boy in School, unless it had been given as a Copy, as Boys in general do not write Sentences out of their own Head in their Copy Books?

I think Boys often scribble in their Copy Books.

Was it written as a Scribble?

All the Paper of the National Board is ruled, so that it was written within the Rules.

Your Observation, that you were in the habit of looking through the Copy Books in order to ascertain the Sentiments of the Masters had reference to Mr. Price's Observation, viz. that it was sharp of you to look through the Copy Books, and it was not made with reference to the finding this Writing?

Just so.

Should you think that to have described this as a written Copy Line found in the Erril National School would have been an incorrect Statement?

I should.

How is the threatening Notice identified with Mr. Price; was his Name in it?

I do not know; I never saw the Notice.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

W.R. Yeilding, Esq.

WILLIAM RICHARD YEILDING Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Gentleman of Landed Property in the County of Limerick?

Some Landed Property, to the Amount of about 1,500*l.* a Year.

Are you of any Profession?

No Profession.

You live, in fact, upon your Landed Property?

I do.

W.R.Yeilding, Esq.

You are connected with some of the principal Families of the County of Limerick?
I am, with some.

Related to them?
Related to them.

And in the County of Kerry?
And in the County of Kerry.

Are you the Head of your Family?
No, I am not.

Are you acquainted with the Reverend Mark Perrin?
I am.

He is Brother to Mr. Justice Perrin.
He is.

What brought you acquainted with him; were you connected with him in any Way to cause an intimate Communication with him?
I was.

What was that Connexion?
Mr. Eyre Lloyd, Son of Mr. Thomas Lloyd, who was Member for the County of Limerick, and I, with others, subscribed to a Fund for the Purpose, among others, of opposing the Pretensions of Colonel Fitzgibbon to represent the County of Limerick in Parliament Six Months before Colonel Fitzgibbon was appointed Lord Lieutenant of the County of Limerick. A younger Brother of mine was the Proprietor of that Paper.

You established a Paper to oppose Colonel Fitzgibbon?
For the avowed Purpose of opposing Colonel Fitzgibbon, among other Purposes, and supporting Mr. Massey Dawson of this City, who was once a Candidate for the County of Limerick, and also Member for that County.

In point of fact you were one of a few Gentlemen who established a Newspaper for the Purpose of County Politics; did you, in conducting that Paper, employ Mr. Mark Perrin?
I did; Mr. Mark Perrin was the Editor of that Paper for a considerable Time.

Did you pay him a Stipend?
He was paid a Salary of Two hundred Guineas a Year by the Office for a Part of the Time; and a smaller Salary when he ceased to compile the Paper.

Were you one of those who had Communication with him as his Employer?
Constant Communication with him, and it was that Communication which led to my knowing any thing about this Transaction.

In consequence of that you frequently saw Mr. Mark Perrin?
Constantly.

In the Year 1834 had you occasion to see him after this Affair at Erril, of which the Committee have heard?
Yes, I had occasion to see him.

Where did you see him?
At his own House at Abbeyleix in Queen's County.

Did he tell you any Circumstances connected with this Erril School?
Not at his House; but it is necessary that I should give a short Explanation to make my Answer intelligible. I was in the habit of going from Abbeyleix, on the Cork Line of Road from Dublin to Johnstown, near Mr. Price's on the Limerick Line of Road from Dublin; and Mr. Perrin was in the habit, on some of those Occasions, of going to Mr. Price, an Acquaintance of his, and therefore we went together. As he and I were going along the Road together he mentioned a Circumstance to me connected with a School, which I presume was the Erril School, from what I have heard since.

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

You were going on your Way where?
With Mr. Perrin, from the Cork Road to the Limerick Road, on my Return home to Limerick.

How far did you go together?
About Five Miles Irish.

In the same Carriage?
In the same Vehicle; it was a Jaunting Car.

In the course of your Journey together he told you certain Particulars?
He did.

Did you stop at any House in the Way?
At Mr. Price's House; I was in the constant habit of being dropped on the Road there, and sometimes of going in there with Mr. Perrin, while waiting for the Coach.

In going to Mr. Price's House in the course of this Drive, he told you certain Things respecting a School in that Neighbourhood?
He did.

What were those Things?
He said "I made a remarkable Discovery here recently: you are aware," said he, "that a threatening Notice was lately posted on some Lands here belonging to the Ladies Fitzpatrick, to whom Mr. Price is Agent, and that he had interested himself in establishing one of the National Education Schools here, and he also had occasion lately to evict some Tenants on the Estate of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, and in consequence of doing so incurred the Hostility of the Peasantry in the Neighbourhood. He had been ditching and improving those Farms, and improving them in one Way or another; and in consequence of this incurred the Hostility of the Peasantry, who erected a Gallows at Night; to this Gallows a Gander was suspended by the Neck, and in the Bill of that Gander there was a Notice put threatening to hang him like the Gander unless he restored certain Tenants that he evicted to the Possession of their Farms." This Notice was found by the Police, and brought to Mr. Price's, as well as I could understand; I will not say to what Part exactly, but at all events Mr. Perrin saw this Notice.

Are you sure Mr. Perrin said he saw this Notice?
Distinctly, for Reasons which I will state as I go along. I may satisfy your Lordships that I am right in thinking so; Mr. Perrin saw this Notice; he observed that it was ruled Paper, and it struck him at once that it must have come out of some of the National Education Schools. Mr. Price was in the habit of occasionally going up to view those Farms, and to look after the Lands, and as Agent to perform the various Duties that he was bound to do to his Principals. Mr. Perrin having a Suspicion, from the Notice being on ruled Paper, that it came out of the School, went, as he told me, or led me to suppose, to a School adjoining the Estate of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, which I believe to be the Erril School, about which there has been so much Discussion. When he went in there he searched the Copy Books, and in turning over the Leaves he perceived one torn out; he took the Notice, and he fitted it to the torn Leaf, and it dovetailed into it. That Incident made such an Impression upon me, and the Thing struck me as so providential a Discovery, that I can state positively and distinctly that he told me that, without the least Apprehension of being mistaken, though it is nearly Three Years ago. In looking over the Copy Books he told me that he found in one of the Books what he considered was a "Lament for the poor Boys hung at Maryborough the other Day." There had been Five or Six Men executed for some Outrages in the Queen's County some Time before. Now Mr. Perrin says it was "God be with the poor Boys that were hung at Maryborough the other Day," but I am stating my Impression of what he originally told me, that it was a Lament; but I think that is of very little Importance. Just as I intended to part from Mr. Perrin I said, "This is too serious an Occurrence to allow it to go unexposed, and I will communicate the Fact to some of the London Papers." "If you do," said he, "you will ruin me." Said I, "How can it ruin you?" "Why," said he, "Mr. Price has been in communication with the

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

Marquis of Landsowne, with the Object of procuring a Living for me, and I expect to get it, and I will be disappointed in getting it in such event; for" said he, " Mr. Price will be annoyed if the Thing should be printed and exposed, and it will produce Effects that will be exceedingly injurious to me." " Well," said I, " if that is the Case I will not do what will injure you, though I feel the Necessity of exposing the Transaction, and how much Inquiry is called for into it." For the Reason I have mentioned I did not expose it. Mr. Perrin has a large Family of Six Children unprovided for. I knew he had been taking an active Part in Whig Politics in Ireland, and had been devoting a great deal of his Time to promoting the Objects of that Party, and I saw he was on the Eve of getting something for his Services, and I did not wish to be his Ruin, for I knew he had little else but his Pen to depend upon. So the Matter remained in that State. I have mentioned the Thing often in the Interim to Persons that I knew would not take the Thing farther, and would not repeat it; among others, I will name one, who is a Member for Parliament, and a Gentleman who is considered a Liberal, Mr. Hector, the Member for Petersfield. I mentioned it to him, and to Mr. Smith O'Brien, the Member for Limerick, who is an Acquaintance of mine; but I never mentioned it where I thought the Feeling of the Party was such as to lead to any Disclosure that might be injurious to Mr. Perrin. I ascertained that Mr. Perrin got his Living. I then thought that there was no Ground for my longer preserving any Mystery about the Transaction, and I mentioned the Thing to Dr. Gifford, the Editor of the Standard, never contemplating that it would come to an Inquiry of this Kind, for I would not be the Cause of submitting Mr. Perrin to an Examination about the Thing that I know must be painful to him. Those are all the Facts, as far as I know.

When did you mention this to Mr. Hector?

I had been laid up with the Rheumatism at the Old Hummums about Six Weeks; Mr. Hector was laid up in the adjoining Hotel, and I was in the habit of going out and dining there and seeing him. Mr. Hector is a Whig, and I am a Tory, and we got together there, and we talked on Political Subjects there occasionally during the Six Weeks, especially about the State of Ireland. The Fact is, I was disabled and could not move about much, and Mr. Hector was also affected with the Rheumatism.

When was this?

This was in the Month of October last Twelvemonth; I was laid up on the Seventeenth of September, and I was not able to stir about much till about the First of November; that is to say, I was not able to walk with perfect Ease. I mentioned it also to Mr. Smith O'Brien, M.P. for the County of Limerick, who is an Acquaintance of mine, when occasionally talking of the State of Ireland. I mentioned the Thing also to Dr. Gifford, and it became a Subject of Newspaper Controversy subsequently; and went from one Step to another till it came to your Lordships.

Had you any Communication with Dr. Gifford about September last upon the Subject?

I had about last July, when it became the Subject of Newspaper Controversy. I wrote to him to state that he quite forgot all the Facts, and that the whole Thing was not understood, and I gave him a Detail in Writing of the Facts then for the first Time.

Did you give him an unfavourable Impression of the Veracity of Mr. Perrin?

I do not recollect that I did; and I have not an unfavourable Opinion of Mr. Perrin. Mr. Perrin is a Man I have a Regard for, and as far as I know I have not known him to state a Falsehood.

In any Communication you had with the Editor of the Standard did you give the Editor of the Standard reason to believe that Mr. Perrin was a Man that ought not to be believed?

I do not think I did; I might have said something with regard to Mr. Price, but I do not think I did with regard to Mr. Perrin. My Impression was, that Mr. Perrin had a perfect Recollection of dovetailing the Notice, for it was a very remarkable Circumstance, a providential Occurrence. The Reason I have it so strongly impressed on my Mind is, that I never lost sight of the Occurrence, and that I was determined to expose it whenever I should have the Opportunity

of

of doing so without Injury to Mr. Perrin. There is no Nobleman present more anxious to expose it than I was. It was nothing but a Regard for Mr. Perrin that made me so unwilling to expose it; and when he got a Living then I thought I could expose it without mentioning his Name or Injury to him. *W. R. Yeilding, Esq.*

When you speak of dovetailing the Notice, what do you mean?
Just fitting it in so that the Two Pieces exactly corresponded together. The threatening Notice put in the Bill of the Gander, and which was brought by the Policeman, was fitted in, in that Sort of Way, in one of the Copy Books in the School.

Did you see this yourself?
I did not; I know nothing about it except what I heard from Mr. Perrin.

Did Mr. Perrin tell you that it dovetailed in that Way?
He did not use the Word dovetailing, but he said that it fitted. "Dovetailing" is a Word of my own.

How did he represent the Fact?
As I have told your Lordships.

What Word did he use?
That it fitted.

When was it that he ascertained that it fitted?
When he went in to inspect the School, his Suspicions having been caused by the Quality of the Paper.

Did he take the Notice that dovetailed with the Copy Book in his Pocket, or where did he get the Notice that dovetailed in with the Copy Book?
I understood that he got it either from the Policeman or from Mr. Price. All I will say positively is, that I understood from Mr. Perrin that the Notice fitted with the Copy Book that he found in the School.

And that he saw it fit?
And that he saw it fit.

And fitted it himself?
So I understand, it might be that somebody else might have taken it and fitted it.

Did it fit into that Page on which was written "The Lament for the Boys that were hung"?
I cannot tell that at this Distance of Time.

Was that a separate Page in the same Book?
I cannot tell your Lordships that; but it was a Copy Book in the School.

You think there was a Copy Book in the School which Mr. Perrin had ascertained to have a torn Leaf which fitted exactly with this Notice that was hung upon the Gander?
That was what I understood.

Are you quite sure that you understood that correctly?
I am as sure of it as I am of my Existence, because it never passed from my Mind; I was so determined to expose the Thing; nothing but a Regard for Mr. Perrin prevented me from instantly exposing it.

You are very zealous upon this Point?
I am certain upon the Point.

Are you zealous upon the Subject?
I am zealous to expose the Iniquity of the Thing.

May not your Zeal have carried you to believing that a little more was stated than was actually stated by Mr. Perrin?
No. There is only One Way in which I can account for Mr. Perrin's Statement being untrue, for it is possible that the Occurrence that Mr. Perrin stated to me did not occur; and that is, that Mr. Perrin might wish to pass himself off for an exceedingly shrewd Fellow; but Mr. Perrin is not a Man that I would suspect to be guilty of such a Piece of little Folly and Vanity; I think

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

think he is too rational and too sensible a Man to be guilty of such little Weakness. That is the only Way in which I can account for his telling me a Falsehood, if he did so.

As to do what?
As to fabricate the Thing.

When did this happen?
About this Time Three Years.

Had you more than One Conversation with Mr. Perrin about it?
Never. We travelled for about an Hour together, and it was the Subject of Conversation almost the whole of the Way.

All the Way?
Not all the Way; but it was the principal Topic of Conversation along the Road.

You are quite sure that he represented that this Notice that was hung to the Gander fitted into the Copy Book?
That is my distinct Recollection.

Is it possible, that, though he told you it fitted into the Copy Book, he might have told you that it was fitted in by somebody else?
Quite possible; I can only speak generally as to the Subject, and I have a Conviction that it was the Belief in his Mind that it was as I state he represented it.

You are not sure that he saw it fitted in?
It is my Impression that he did.

Are you sure that he told you so?
That he told me so I have no Doubt about.

That he saw that it fitted in?
Yes, quite sure, though he tells me now that I am mistaken; but I am not mistaken, I am quite certain.

When you said that you had had only One Conversation with Mr. Perrin in the Way you have described, you do not mean to include a Conversation which you have had since you met in London?
Of course I do not. I mean upon that Occasion.

You have had some Conversation with Mr. Perrin since you have been in London together?
I have; I told him what I have stated here.

Did he tell you that his Recollection differed from yours?
I do not know that it is right to state what he stated in the next Room, but if your Lordships ask me I will state it, though I do not see that it is of any moment. What he said was this; he said, "I do not remember that I told you so; I know there was a strong Suspicion that the Schoolmaster was the Person who wrote the Notice." I should have told your Lordships that he looked upon it that the Notice was the Schoolmaster's Hand disguised.

Did he tell you that here?
Not at all; but he told me then that that was the Impression.

Did you see Mr. Price at the Time that you went in the Jaunting Car with Mr. Perrin?
I did; and it is not Once or Twice, but I suppose Half a Dozen Times, that this occurred, for I was in the constant habit of going up to Dublin, and used to come down on the Cork Road as far as Abbeyleix, and used to cross over to the Limerick Road; the Limerick Coach passed Mr. Price's Gate.

And you always, on each Occasion, had a similar Conversation?
I do not suppose that upon every Occasion we talked about the same Matter; we never talked about it but once.

You were understood to say that you talked about it frequently?
I never intended to say so.

Have

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

Have you frequently talked upon the Subject, or not?

No, we never talked upon the Subject but upon this One Occasion, except here; the Thing dropped, and there was no more about it; I understood that Mr. Price did not wish to have the Thing get Publicity.

Had you ever any Conversation with Mr. Price upon the Subject?

Never, because Mr. Perrin's Object was that Mr. Price should know nothing about my knowing it; the Object was to conceal the Thing.

Why did you understand that it was Mr. Perrin's Object to conceal it?

It was on account of Mr. Price that he wished to conceal it, not on account of himself. The Fact is, that there was a Bit of Satire in this Notice irrespective of his not wishing to injure the Schools, for I know that Mr. Price conscientiously thinks that the Schools will better the Condition of the lower Classes in Ireland, and it is a Subject upon which many well-meaning Men will differ in Opinion. Mr. Price did not wish to give those Schools in their Infancy a Blow that would injure them very severely, and that was One Motive, I take it, that he did not wish the Thing to be known, the Schoolmaster being a Man appointed by himself, and the whole Thing being got up by himself.

Then you think Mr. Perrin's Motive in wishing it not to be told was a Fear of offending Mr. Price, was it?

Precisely. It was not an Apprehension that it would have any Influence with the Marquis of Lansdowne, but Mr. Price himself did not wish to have the Thing get Publicity. The Fact is, that Mr. Price was the Person who got up the School, he was the Patron of it, and he did not wish to have the School injured: and I must tell your Lordships that the great Bulk of the Gentlemen about Mr. Price are opposed to him on Political Grounds, and it was placing him in a very awkward Position, and that he would be the Object of Ridicule to the whole Neighbourhood if the Thing came out.

You believe, then, that Mr. Perrin wished this Transaction not to become public from the Apprehension of offending Mr. Price?

Decidedly, that is my Opinion.

Are you aware that this Transaction which Mr. Price, in your Opinion, wished not to be made public, was the Subject of a Communication by Mr. Price to the Board of Education immediately after it occurred?

What he communicated I am not exactly aware of.

Are you aware that it was the Subject of a Communication to the Board of Education?

It was only partly, as well as I could learn. I will just mention another Fact that I had omitted stating: this Schoolmaster had been recommended by a Roman Catholic Clergyman in the Neighbourhood to Mr. Price. When Mr. Price was satisfied in his own Mind, as I understood it, that he had written this Notice and that he had put it up, and all that Sort of Thing, he was anxious to get rid of him; he was also anxious to save the Schools from the Injury that would be done to them, and he went to this Priest, as I understood it, and told him, such a Person, naming the Schoolmaster, is a very bad Character, and I wish to get rid of him. "What has he done?" said the Priest. Mr. Price could tell him, but he would not tell him, because it would have been his Duty as a Magistrate to have indicted him for putting up a seditious Notice. In fact he could give him a Reason, but he gave him no Reason. However, I understood subsequently, that he made a Communication to the Board, in which the Fact of this Notice, as Mr. Perrin told me, having been dovetailed or fitted in, was omitted altogether, and the Ground taken for getting rid of the Schoolmaster was the lesser Charge in the way of Iniquity.

What was the Iniquity?

I look upon it, that the serious Thing was the writing of the Notice.

What was the lesser Charge?

"The Lament for the poor Boys that were hung at Maryborough the other Day," which I consider to be the more trifling Charge.

Who told you these Circumstances with regard to what was understood to have passed between Mr. Price and the Priest?

Mr. Perrin. He told me that he understood it from Mr. Price. I am not

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

speaking to any Fact, except what Mr. Perrin told me. As to the Notice Part of it I am quite clear, for it was a Subject of constant Consideration.

Did Mr. Perrin allude to his Expectation of getting any particular Living?
No particular Living.

But only to a general Expectation or Hope that he might get a Living?
That he would get a Living. I may mention another Circumstance. The Fact is, that Mr. Perrin and I differ as to our Recollection of the Thing, and therefore I think it right to state every thing that goes to confirm my Recollection of it. I would be sorry to say that Mr. Perrin would state what was not the Fact; but I will mention another Circumstance with reference to the Communication of the Marquis of Lansdowne. When Mr. Price applied to have the Marquis of Lansdowne interfere about his getting a Living, he said that the Marquis of Lansdowne expressed his Surprise that the Brother of Mr. Perrin, who was the principal and chief Adviser of the Government of Ireland, should be left so long unprovided for.

Your Connexion with Mr. Perrin, as the Editor of the Paper with which you were connected, had ceased at this Time, had it not?
No; it was the Business of the Paper which made me see him, as I best recollect.

Was he the Editor of the Paper at that Time?
He was partly the Editor, and he was partly not the Editor. The Fact is, that Mr. Perrin is in Principle a Whig, and the Paper was in Principle Tory. There was a Tory Editor, and Mr. Perrin, who is an exceeding clever Man, was in the habit of writing Articles at the Time. At that Time the Whig Party, and what we call in Ireland the Radical or O'Connell Party, were in Opposition; there was "Perrin's Tail" and "O'Connell's Tail;" and Mr. Perrin was opposed to the O'Connell Party; in short, Mr. O'Connell was then denouncing Lord Grey's Administration or Party. So far as Mr. O'Connell was concerned, Mr. Perrin adopted our view of the Thing in opposing Mr. O'Connell, and he used to write Articles abusing him right and left; but he would never write a Tory Article, and therefore we had a Tory Editor to do so.

Did your Brother still hold that Paper at the Time of this Conversation?
My Brother went to America, and then my Father became the Proprietor.

Had you any Share in the Property?
I had an Interest as Creditor in this Way: The Fact was, that Mr. Eyre Lloyd and I contributed a large Sum of Money to establish the Paper, and to meet its Expenditure. There were large Sums due to me and to Mr. Eyre Lloyd, and in that Way I was interested; but I had not a legal Share in it; I had no legal Rights in the Thing.

Mr. Perrin was very anxious to keep all this Story secret?
I have stated so.

What was his Reason for telling you all this Story?
It is the Weakness of almost every one to wish to act the Hero. Mr. Perrin wished to show his extreme Shrewdness and Cleverness, and I attribute his telling it to me to that little Weakness; and it is one of the few Weaknesses that I ever knew him to possess.

You think that Mr. Perrin told you all the Story in order to display himself before you as a Hero?
People will very often repeat from such a Motive that which they would not wish to go farther; I think it was partly that; I will not say altogether.

Do you think one additional Reason was, that you were so very silent and secret a Person. Do you think that he communicated this to you, which he wished to keep secret, because you were so peculiarly secret and silent, and so little communicative?
I cannot tell what was passing in his Mind.

Did

W.R. Yeilding, Esq.

Did he know that you had the indirect Connexion you have mentioned with the Newspaper at the Time that he told you these Things?
To be sure he did; and it would have appeared in that Paper the very next Post but for his stating that it would operate prejudicially to him.

How soon did you communicate these Circumstances to any Person after this? Was it to Mr. Hector at the Hummums?
I dare say. I have very often mentioned them, but never in any Place or with the Object of their going farther.

Do you recollect who was the Person to whom you first mentioned it?
I cannot tell.

You mentioned it to a great many Persons?
Yes.

Was it you who communicated these Circumstances to the Bishop of Exeter?
No; I made the Communication to Dr. Gifford, the Editor of the Standard.

When did you communicate it to Dr. Gifford?
I wrote a Letter detailing all the Facts to Dr. Gifford last Summer, after it was adverted to in Parliament. I mentioned it incidentally to him in Conversation, in talking about the State of Ireland, before that; but he had not the Facts fully then.

How long was that before?
I cannot say exactly.

Was it speedily after the Conversation with Mr. Perrin in the Jaunting Car?
A considerable Period, perhaps a Year and a Half, after.

Had you mentioned it to any other Person in the intermediate Year and a Half?
Often.

Can you tell how soon it was that you mentioned it?
I could not speak of Days and Months of an Occurrence nearly Three Years ago. I remember mentioning it to Mr. Hector, because it was accompanied with the Circumstance that we were both confined with Rheumatism; we were seated by each other often, and we had little else to do in the Evenings but to talk.

Did you ascertain that Mr. Perrin had got the Living he expected before you divulged it?
I did, because it was that that prevented me from divulging it.

By "divulging" do you mean before you mentioned it in private Conversation to Persons that you thought would not tell?
No; I had often mentioned it to Persons that I knew would not tell it. I mentioned it to Mr. Smith O'Brien; I knew he was favourable to those Schools, and I mentioned it to him in proof of their working badly; and in the same Way I mentioned it to Mr. Hector. I knew those Men would never send the Thing farther, that there it would stop, as they were Whigs.

Has Mr. Perrin got the Living?
He has.

What Living?
Kilsallaghan.

Who is the Patron of the Living?
The Government, I believe.

Do you mean the Lord Lieutenant?
The Irish Administration. I know that he got the Living.

When did he get that Living?
I suppose about a Year and a Half ago.

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

Was it in a public Conveyance that you had the Conversation with Mr. Perrin?

No, it was in a Jarvey; he and I were travelling alone from M'Evoy's Hotel, near where Mr. Perrin lived at Abbeyleix. I was in the habit of getting a Jaunting Car.

It contained but you and Mr. Perrin?

But me and Mr. Perrin. There is one Thing I should state in reply to a former Question, that I never divulged the Thing with the Intention of its getting Publicity till Mr. Perrin was sure of his Living.

In the Communications which you thus made to your Friends or to the Editor of the Standard did you mention the Circumstance of the Notice having fitted with a corresponding Part of the Copy Book?

I always stated that it dovetailed or fitted into it; that was the Fact above all others of which I have the most perfect Recollection, because there was something remarkable in the Discovery of it.

Did you mention it to the Editor of the Standard before or after Mr. Perrin had got the Living?

I was in the habit of getting Papers and Letters from Ireland, and I had reason to suppose that Mr. Perrin's Living was secured to him before I mentioned it.

Do you know any thing of your own Knowledge of the Marquis of Lansdowne having procured that Living for Mr. Perrin?

I know nothing at all about it, except what Mr. Perrin told me.

Did Mr. Perrin tell you that the Marquis of Lansdowne had procured that Living for him?

Never; but he expected it at the Time, and he did not wish to incur the Displeasure of Mr. Price. I understood that Mr. Price had applied to the Marquis of Lansdowne for a Living for him.

But the Question is, whether of your own Knowledge you know that the Marquis of Lansdowne procured that Living for Mr. Perrin?

I know nothing about it.

Of your own Knowledge you do not know that Mr. Price applied to Lord Lansdowne for Mr. Perrin?

No; I know nothing of Mr. Price beyond a mere bowing Acquaintance.

Did Mr. Perrin state to you that Mr. Price had applied to Lord Lansdowne for a Living for him?

Yes, he did.

Was it in the same Expedition?

He assigned that as a Reason for not wishing to have the Thing get Publicity, as I now best recollect.

Did he assign as a Reason that Mr. Price had applied, or that he hoped that Mr. Price would apply?

I understood him to say that if this got Publicity Mr. Price's Interference would cease; that if it transpired Mr. Price must know that it transpired through Mr. Perrin.

Was the Impression upon your Mind, that Mr. Price had applied to the Marquis of Lansdowne, or that Mr. Perrin hoped that Mr. Price would apply to the Marquis of Lansdowne?

No; that is a Thing I will not speak positively to; but my Opinion is, that he had applied, and that he was at the Time using his friendly Offices for the Advantage of Mr. Perrin with the Marquis of Lansdowne.

How was it that the Publication of these Facts was to injure Mr. Perrin's Hope?

Because he calculated that Mr. Price would cease to use his Influence with the Marquis of Lansdowne; that Mr. Price was so anxious that the Thing should not be disclosed.

W. R. Yeilding, Esq.

This was about Three Years ago?

It was about this Time Three Years.

Did Mr. Perrin state whether he had applied himself directly to the Marquis of Lansdowne, or whether he had applied through Mr. Price?

I did not say that Mr. Perrin himself at all applied to the Marquis of Lansdowne through any one; but what I understood was this; that Mr. Price, who is a Friend of Mr. Perrin's, was using his Influence with the Marquis of Lansdowne to procure some Living, not any particular Living, for Mr. Perrin. There is one Thing I wish to state; I cannot be perfectly accurate when it was that I first made those Communications to Dr. Gifford, but I never made them with the Intention of their being exposed till after Mr. Perrin had got his Living; I wish that to be understood, for I cannot tell exactly when it was that I called upon him.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 17° *Aprilis* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

WILLIAM RICHARD YEILDING Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

The Committee understand that you are desirous of offering some Explanation of the Answer which you gave to the last Question which was put to you?

Yes; I was asked whether I had ever divulged the Conversation that took place between Mr. Perrin and me to any Person till his Living was secured. The Thing having occurred some Time ago I was not prepared to give a distinct Answer at the Time; and I think it necessary to offer some Explanation, for I thought there was an Impression on the Mind of one Noble Lord that I ought not to have divulged this Circumstance when I did; this brought me to turn my Mind to the Subject, and to think how it was and when it was that I first communicated it. I called a short Time before, perhaps near a Month, on Dr. Gifford, and I stated all I have stated to your Lordships with reference to the School and to the Conversation which occurred between Mr. Perrin and me. I told him that I would not injure Mr. Perrin by giving Publicity to the Facts, but that if it were practicable to give the Facts Publicity without Injury to him I wished to do it, and I felt the Importance of it; I told him that I would call upon him again, and talk the Matter over, but I conceive that it was distinctly understood between Dr. Gifford and me, that what I said to him was confidential and private, and was not intended to go further without my Sanction. I am clearly under the Impression that I never intended that the Transaction should be divulged, at least till Mr. Perrin's Living was secured, and being under that Impression I take it for granted that I acted upon it; but I remember this Conversation with Dr. Gifford, and I think it right to explain that I was taken ill immediately after, as I stated before, and I was confined Five or Six Weeks in Town with Rheumatism. I went off to the Country—to Plymouth, and I never heard more of the Transaction; and in fact I never authorized any Person to communicate it. Dr. Gifford knew that I would not disclose the Transaction till the Living was got, and Dr. Gifford having ascertained, through the public Press I suppose, that the Living was obtained by Mr. Perrin, felt himself at liberty to divulge the Thing; but all I know is that I never authorized him to divulge it till last Summer, after it became the Subject of Discussion in Parliament.

What was the Circumstance that gave you the Impression that the Committee thought that you had acted improperly in divulging it?

From Questions put to me by a Noble Lord. I was asked whether Mr. Perrin did not tell it me because he thought I would not divulge it; that seemed to convey to me that Mr. Perrin said the Thing in confidence to me. If Mr. Perrin supposed that I would not do him an Injury he supposed what was right, for I would be exceedingly sorry to do him an Injury either now or then.

Is there any other Answer in your Evidence respecting which you wish to offer an Explanation?

There is. I was asked "Are you aware that it was the Subject of a Communication to the Board of Education?" Now, I beg to say that, in answer to this Question, what I wished to convey was this, that I looked upon it that the Statutable Crime, which was triable at the Assizes before a Judge and Jury, and which would have exposed and ripped up the whole of this

W.R.Yeilding, Esq.

Transaction, was passed over, and that that which was the Moral Crime, which was triable before the Board of Education, was the One that was gone into. That was the Answer which I wished to give.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

The Reverend MARK PERRIN is called in, and further examined as follows:

The Committee understand that you wish to offer an Explanation upon the Subject of one of your Answers; will you specify the Question to which the Answer referred which you desire to explain?

The Question was whether I was at the Time connected with Mr. Yeilding in any way; I said that I was not. I meant that I was not connected with him as an Editor, but I still was connected, as I qualified it afterwards, as a Writer.

In a Conversation which you are stated to have had with Mr. Yeilding relating to a School at Erril did you express any Wish to Mr. Yeilding that the Communication which you then incidentally made to him should be concealed?

I do not think I did, but if I did it must have been if he expressed a Wish to publish it, but when I mentioned it to him I mentioned it to him as I would any common Occurrence.

You do not think that you did not, but you are not sure?

I am not quite sure that I did not; if Mr. Yeilding mentioned that he wished to publish it, I certainly would have requested him not to do it.

From what Motive would you have requested him not to do so?

I do not think that Mr. Price would have liked, and I certainly would not have liked myself, to have my Name mixed up with a Transaction publicly stated even upon an indifferent Subject; I had no Fear of the Circumstance itself being stated.

Did Mr. Price ever express any Wish to you that the Circumstance should be concealed?

Never.

Had you the least Reason to believe that Mr. Price had any such Feeling or Desire?

Not the least; I thought that Mr. Price was rather fond of introducing the Subject; I had heard him speak of it in mixed Companies continually.

At any other Time has any Wish been expressed to you from any Quarter that that Transaction should be concealed?

Never by any Person.

Can you conceive any Motive that Mr. Price could have for its being concealed?

No, indeed I cannot.

Do you mean that he did not wish to have any Portion of it concealed, either with reference to the Notice which he got, or with respect to the Discovery which he made in the Cottage?

I did not think that Mr. Price would like to have his Name in the Paper as having received a threatening Notice.

Do you think that Mr. Price had any Objection whatever to the threatening Notice he received being made known?

I heard him speak of it continually in Company.

And you had no Reason whatever to think from any thing that occurred that he did not wish it to be generally known?

I do not think he did, but I do not think Mr. Price would have liked to have seen his Name in the public Papers.

But

Rev. Mark Perrin.

But that was entirely your own Conjecture, not founded upon any Communication made from him, or upon any Wish you ever heard him express?
Certainly not; I often heard him joking about the Effigy that was put up.

Would that have been your Reason for desiring Mr. Yeilding not to publish it in the Paper if he mentioned to you that he meant to publish it, and if in that Case you desired him not to publish it?
It would.

Not from any Reasons with reference to yourself?
Certainly not.

Not with reference to your Prospect of Preferment?
Certainly not.

Where was this Conversation with Mr. Yeilding; was it in a Jaunting Car?
In a Jaunting Car.

Have you ever had any Communication with Mr. Yeilding about it at any Time since?
In the Waiting-room here, he offered me Two or Three Apologies for having unintentionally brought me here.

Did he express any Opinion to you as to the Value or Importance of the Transaction?
He gave me Two as I conceived contradictory Statements of the Manner in which he let the Thing be known; he said first, that he was very anxious that it should be exposed, but that he delayed doing so till he was sure that I was provided for with a Living; he afterwards, in the Presence of Mr. Price and Mr. Kelly, stated, that he had mentioned the Thing incidentally in Conversation to Dr. Gifford, the Editor of the Standard, and that he was quite surprised afterwards when he saw it mentioned in the Speech of the Bishop of Exeter.

What had your being provided for to do with this Circumstance being mentioned?
I suppose he thought it would stop my Promotion by my Name being published as having told him that Circumstance.

Had you any Opinion of the Kind yourself?
I should think it would rather be a Recommendation of me to the present Government if I had endeavoured to correct any Abuses in the National Schools.

Then that Opinion was merely an Opinion of his own, not founded upon any Sort of Communication that ever passed between you and him?
Certainly not.

Do you think it possible that you could have mentioned Lord Lansdowne's Name as connected with any Living and have forgotten it?
I mentioned Lord Lansdowne's Name to Mr. Yeilding.

In what Way?
In speaking of Mr. Price; in telling Mr. Yeilding what a kind and good Friend he had been to me, I mentioned that which is the Truth; he had recommended me to Lord Lansdowne on the Occasion of my leaving Ireland. I had got a Nomination to a Chapel in Wales, and was leaving Ireland, and I wrote a Letter to Mr. Price thanking him for his Kindness to me; Mr. Price, I understood, afterwards forwarded that Letter to Lord Lansdowne, with a Request that he would recommend me to the Irish Government for Promotion; I saw Lord Lansdowne's Answer to Mr. Price, saying that he was surprised that the Irish Government had not done something for me, for that he knew that they had a great Respect for my Brother, but that probably I was like many others, impatient, and anxious to get Promotion when there was no Vacancy, that however he would mention the Subject, and ask why I had not been promoted.

Did that Application refer to any particular Piece of Preferment?
Certainly not; nor did I ever build any Hopes upon that Application.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Had you rendered any special Services to the Government?
No.

You were engaged in a Newspaper in Limerick; was that the only Newspaper in which you had been engaged?
I had been Proprietor of a Newspaper myself previously to that.

Where was that Newspaper published?
In Dublin.

What was the Name of it?
The Plain Dealer.

Did that Newspaper agree in its Politics with the Politics of the Government of which Lord Lansdowne is a Member?
I think that Newspaper gave the Government a great deal of Displeasure.

Did the Politics of that Newspaper agree with the Politics of the Government of which Lord Lansdowne is a Member?
We supported the great leading Principles of the Government; but we thought their Irish Policy was very bad, and we condemned it.

Then it was not with any Reference to Services supposed to be rendered by your Paper, that you conceived that Mr. Price might make an Application to Lord Lansdowne?
It was not; for, on the contrary, I considered I was a marked Man with the Irish Government for having been connected with that Paper.

Was there the slightest Reference in the Communication which you say you saw from the Marquis of Lansdowne to Mr. Price to any Political Service whatever?
Certainly not the slightest.

Do you know the Rev. William Treacy?
No, I never was in his Company.

Did you ever hear that he was given at all to Anti-tithe Agitation?
I heard that he refused to pay his own Tithes; I never heard that he was an Agitator, and I heard one Circumstance with respect to him which would imply the contrary; he lived on Terms of great Intimacy for many Years with the Protestant Rector of the Parish, who was the Uncle, I believe, of the late Marquis of Waterford.

How long ago was that?
That was previous to the Agitation of the Tithe Question.

Have you heard of his living on good Terms with the present Rector?
No, I believe they have had a Quarrel.

Has he had any Communication with him since?
I should think not.

Do you know these Facts of your own Knowledge?
No, but they were quite notorious in the County; I have often heard Mr. Monk condemned in Conversation for living in so much Intimacy with the Priest.

In being examined touching the Widow Kilfoyle's House, you were asked, "Do you remember whether there was a numerous Family there?" the Answer was, "I recollect Two or Three young Women and a Man." You were asked whether there were any Boys there; you said "I did not see any Child there at all." "By Boy is meant from Ten to Twenty?"—"Not any." "You wanted Pen and Ink, did not you?"—"Mr. Price wanted some Pen and Ink and some Paper to write some Directions." "And you sent to the School for it?"—"We sent for Paper; I do not know whether they got it out of the School or not." "Mr. Price says, I believe she went to the School, but wherever she went she brought back a Copy Book?"—"Yes." "The Copy Book that she brought back came from the School?"—"I am not aware of that." To your Recollection have you ever given a different Account from that of what passed in the House in which you found the Copy Book?
I do not recollect ever having given any Account different from that.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

Have you ever stated that having occasion to call at a Farmhouse on the Estate it was stated to us that a Boy belonging to it had been in the habit of going to the School, though not that Day in Attendance, and his Copy was produced to show what Progress he had made?

I may have made a Statement of that Kind, but I do not think that there is much Variation between the Two.

In the one Case you have said that there was no Boy belonging to the Family, that the Occasion of having this Book produced was Mr. Price having sent somewhere out of the House for Paper, and that it was produced merely for that Purpose, and now you are asked whether, a different Reason being stated, it is possible you could have given that Reason?

I did not state that they had sent out of the House for the Book; my Impression was that the Book was in the House.

You stated "Mr. Price wanted some Pen and Ink and some Paper; we sent for Paper; I do not know whether they got it out of the School or not; Mr. Price says, I believe she went to the School, but wherever she went she brought back a Copy Book." Now you will perceive that you have said that there was no Boy in the House, none between Ten and Twenty in that House; but you will perceive that the Question that has just been asked is whether you have ever stated that the Reason of your having the Book was that a Boy belonging to the Family was in the habit of going to School, though not that Day in Attendance, and his Copy was produced to show what Progress he had made?

My Impression was that the Boy did belong to the Family; there was no Boy present in the House.

The Questions that were put were answered thus:—"Was there a numerous Family?" Your Answer is, "There was an old Woman and Two or Three young Women and a Man." "Any Boys there?"—"I did not see any Child there at all." "By Boys is meant from Ten to Twenty?"—"Not any." "You wanted Pen and Ink, did not you?"—"Mr. Price wanted some Pen" and so on; that implies that there was no Boy present. Now, does it appear to you that the other Account, if you ever gave it, is consistent with this Account of sending for the Book merely for the Purpose of getting that Pen, Ink, and Paper?

I remember there was a Conversation about the School previous to Mr. Price calling for the Paper; he asked them what they thought of the School, and they said they thought it was a very good School; and afterwards, when the Book was produced, our Attention was called to the Copies as showing the Truth of their Opinion; but whether it was the Copy of a Boy of the Family I do not know; my Impression was that it belonged to a Boy of the Family. Mr. Price asked them to send for the Boy as soon as we discovered this Paper in the Book, and they said he was out at work.

Then if you were told that the Boy who had written that Copy was a Boy named Fitzgerald or Fitzpatrick, would that have been one of the Boys of the House?

I do not know whether it would have been one of the Boys of the House or not; she was a Widow Woman and had some Daughters who were married, at least I heard her apply for Part of the Land for one of the married Daughters, so that it might have been a Grandson of the Widow Kilfoyle for any thing I heard to the contrary.

Do you happen to know whether the young Men who were executed at Maryborough, who were the Subject of that Paper, were educated?

I heard that one of them of the Name of Dunphy was educated at the Parochial School of Aghavoe.

Do you know whether the others were?

I do not know where the others who were executed were educated; but Dunphy's Brother, who was afterwards pardoned for the same Offence, I understood, was also educated at the same School.

Do you know Mr. Yeilding intimately?

I have known him a good while.

Rev. Mark Perrin.

You have been just appointed to your present Living?
I have been upwards of a Year.

You have not had occasion to recover any Tithe?
I never have looked for any; I never asked for any Tithe yet, but I have received a large Proportion of my Tithe.

In what Part of Ireland is your Living?
In the County of Dublin, within Eight Miles of Dublin.

You are Brother to Judge Perrin, who was formerly Attorney General for Ireland?
I am.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Have you the Affidavit which Mr. Kelly the Inspector mentions in his Report Page 24, as having been made by Mr. M'Donnell at Castlebar?
I have, but not here; I can produce it if required.

Can you also furnish the Minutes of the Board relative to this Case?
I have transcribed them and brought them with me.

Is the Transcript that you now produce a Transcript of all the Minutes respecting the Case of Achill?
It is.

And respecting any Part of the Transactions referred to in these Returns?
Not altogether, as there is another Case, that of Cassidy, also mentioned in these Returns; I have not transcribed any Minutes respecting that.

But with the Exception of that?
Yes; and supplemental to that Return, I have brought down certain Letters which are not given there, namely, my Letters to Mr. Kelly the Inspector; I have also brought Letters that passed between Mr. Connolly, who is the Roman Catholic Clergyman, and myself; I have also brought a Minute of a Conversation that passed between Mr. Dombrain, who is the Inspector General of the Coast-guard, and Mr. Carlile, with respect to the Point now before the Committee.

Is that Mr. Carlile's Handwriting?
It is, and delivered by him to me. Upon the former Day my Attention was directed to the Omission of Two Letters in reference to the Erril School; one of these was stated to be a Letter of the 14th July 1836; there is no such Letter; the Letter alluded to is dated the 14th January 1836, and is already handed in; the Mistake with respect to its Date has arisen from the Copy of the Letter in which this Letter of the 14th of January is referred to being erroneously dated the 27th of July 1836, whereas its true Date is the 22d of January 1836, being a Reply to the Letter of the 14th of January 1836, and beginning thus: "In reply to your Letter of the 14th instant."

Will you deliver in the Papers you have now produced?

The Witness delivers in the same, which are read, and are as follow:

"Extract of Board's Minute, dated 5th November 1835.

"Present:—Most Reverend Dr. Murray, Reverend Dr. Sadleir.

"Read the Report of Mr. Kelly, the Inspector, upon the Teacher of Dugorth National School, of the 24th Ultimo; and also a Letter from Rev. Mr. Connolly, dated the 25th Ultimo, upon the same Subject.

"Considered that the Replies contained in these to the Charges advanced by the Rev. Mr. Nangle against this Teacher are satisfactory."

"Minute,

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

" Minute, 18th August 1836.

" Present:—The Archbishop of Dublin, Rev. Mr. Carlile, A. R. Blake, Esquire.

" Considered a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Nangle, dated 13th July ultimo, containing certain Accusations against Cassidy, the Teacher of Duiga National School, and also against O'Donnell, the Teacher of the Dugorth National School.

" Considered also the Reports of the Inspector, dated the 24th and 30th July respectively, upon these several Charges, together with the Letters of Captain Irwin of the Coast Guard, dated respectively 14th and 30th of July, and also the Letter of the Secretary of the 6th of August, replying thereupon to the Rev. Mr. Nangle.

" Resolved, That the Charges brought forward against Cassidy appear to be altogether frivolous and unfounded; and that with respect to the Allegations against O'Donnell, the Board deem it expedient to see Mr. Dombrain, the Inspector General of the Coast-guard, at as early a Day as possible."

" Minute, 13th October 1836.

" Present:—Duke of Leinster, Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Rev. Dr. Sadleir, Rev. James Carlile, A. R. Blake, Esquire.

" Read a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Nangle, dated 22d August, and which had been presented to the Board on a former Board Day.

" Ordered, That this Letter be forwarded to the Chief Secretary, with a Request, that as it referred to Matters which involved a Breach of the Peace, he would submit it to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, in order that such Steps relative thereto should be taken as might be deemed expedient.

" Rev[d] Sir, Education Office, 16th September 1835.

" The Commissioners of Education especially wish and direct that the Masters of National Schools should abstain from all Processions, carrying Flags, or partaking in any way of party or political Colouring.

" The Reason is obvious; the main Object of a co-operating and common System of Education being destroyed if any Teacher employed under it bind himself by his Acts to either one or other Party.

" O'Donnell, Teacher of the Dugorth National School, has been on a late Occasion represented as offending against this Rule, through Ignorance it is presumed.

" Will you therefore set him right, and let him learn that one of the Duties of his Office is to conduct himself in Goodwill towards all Men.

" I remain, Sir,
Your very obedient Servant,
Thos. F. Kelly."

" Rev[d] M. Connolly,
Achill, Newport Pratt."

" Sir, Achill, 20th September 1835.

" I have the Honour to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of the 16th instant, and beg your Acceptance of my most sincere Thanks for the kind Manner you were pleased to convey to me the Wish and Directions of the National Board regarding Teachers under their Patronage taking Part in Party Business.

" With reference to the Case alluded to, I certainly did not conceive that it merited that Name, nor can I understand how even our Enemies could designate it as such. Our Archbishop paid us a Visit in the Discharge of his Episcopal Duties, and the People (as is usual since his Translation to the See of Tuam) went out to welcome him to this retired Corner of his Archdiocese, carrying Flags and Banners to show their Veneration and Respect to him whom they love; this could not surely be called Party Business, particularly in Achill, where all the Natives are Catholics; there were no Party Tunes, no Party Colours, no revolutionary Mottos; in fact, nothing calculated to give Offence

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

or Annoyance to any one, except indeed that, in spite of Lies, Calumny, and Bribery, all the People were unanimous in testifying their Reverence and Esteem for their Bishop. O'Donnell walked with the Body; he might carry a Flag; I am sure he did; but neither he, I am sure, or any of us, bore the least Illwill to any Man.

"The Directions of the Board shall be most strictly complied with; indeed we owe them too many Obligations and respect you, Sir, too much, to deviate a single Iota from any Instructions they or you may be pleased to send us.

"Thanking you, Sir, most sincerely,
I have the Honour to remain your much obliged
and most obedient humble Servant,
MARTIN CONNOLLY, P.P.
Achill."

"Thos F. Kelly, Esq.
&c. &c."

"Revd Sir, Education Office, 2d October 1835.

"I have to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of the 20th ultimo upon the 1st instant, and am directed by the Commissioners of Education to state their Satisfaction at its Contents in reply to my Letter of the 16th Ultimo.

"I remain, Sir,
Your very obedient Servant,
THOS. F. KELLY."

"Rev M. Connolly,
Achill, Newport Pratt."

"Revd Sir, Education Office, 17th October 1835.

"The Rev. Mr. Nangle complains that James O'Donnell is using very unworthy Means to prevent Children attending a School under his (Mr. N's) Patronage.

"He states that O'Donnell with a Knife in his Hand threatened to take the Head off one of these Children for attending his (Mr. Nangle's) School.

"Will you have the goodness to ascertain if this have happened, and should O'Donnell appear to you to be guilty of such very violent and indecorous Conduct, the Commissioners of Education are satisfied that you will so represent to him the Impropriety of it that henceforth any Account which may be forwarded to this Office of him may be that of a Man moderately and becomingly discharging the Duties of his Station.

"Will you, in every Event, have the goodness to represent to him the Effects which must result from his acting according to the Principles inculcated in the 'general Lesson,' hung up in all the National Schools by Direction of the Commissioners, which says, Christians should endeavour to live peaceably with all Men, (Rom. ch. 12. v. 18.) even with those of a different religious Persuasion.

"I am to request that at your earliest Convenience you will favour me with your Report upon this Subject.

"I remain, Sir,
Your very obedient Servant,
THOS F. KELLY."

"Revd M. Connolly,
Achill, Newport Pratt."

"Sir, Achill, 25th October 1835.

"After my Arrival here on Yesterday I lost no Time in seeing the persecuted O'Donnell, Teacher of the Dugorth National School, for the Purpose of ascertaining whether he was guilty of the Charge of which he stands accused by Rev. Mr. Nangle before the National Board. I did not confine my Inquiries to him alone, but before and after Divine Service this Day required and requested Information on the Subject from the Villagers of Dugorth, and all such others as could possibly be acquainted with the Case. I feel happy to inform you that they all bore Testimony to the excellent Character and mild Deportment of O'Donnell, and expressed themselves ready to go any where, and any Distance, to rebut the Charge, which they believe to be false, calumnious, and unfounded, but advanced by the Enemies of Order here, for the Purpose of having poor O'Donnell removed from conducting the Dugorth School. But what is the mighty Charge? It is this,—that O'Donnell threatened

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

threatened to cut the Ears off a Child who attended Mr. Nangle's School should he (the Child) go there again ; surely such Conduct is unbecoming and indecorous, and O'Donnell should be severely reprimanded for it, were he capable of being guilty of such unmanly Conduct. But it may be pertinent to enquire who this Child is? What is his Age? And how it happens that he alone out of the other different Persons who from Time to Time were in the habit of attending this School, should be selected by Mr. O'Donnell as an Object of his Vengeance? This Child is then the Son of one Guity, from the Village of Drinine, Three Miles distant from the Colony ; his Father is a poor, wretched, miserable Pauper, who (if Report be true) has made his Conditions with the Man of Money and of Bibles, and is determined to change his Religion with his Rags. His Age is about Nine Years, surely a grave Witness! and no other Human Being can be found who will bear him out, or say that O'Donnell ever spoke to him, except indeed his Father, who, though at the Time some Miles off, is ready to depose that his Child had been thus treated by O'Donnell; surely under these Circumstances a Person will naturally hesitate to give Credence to such Evidence, which may be influenced by Rewards and Promises, particularly when O'Donnell, a Man of Truth and Character, is prepared to declare on his solemn Oath, that so far from threatening this Child, he never knew him, never (to his Knowledge) saw him. I have insinuated above that the Child's Father might be tampered with ; I hesitate not to declare, from my Acquaintance with the System pursued by the Colonists, that such might be the Fact, and that any Means, however unreputable they may be, would be readily adopted for the base Purpose of obtaining their End. But why should Mr. Nangle thus persecute O'Donnell? The Reasons are obvious ; Mr. Nangle since his Connexion with Achill for the last few Years has exerted himself in every possible Way to proselytize the unfortunate uneducated Natives ; he has employed, at a Salary of 20*l.* a Year for each, a Posse of ignorant fanatical Preachers, who are sent through the Parish, armed with Fire-arms and Bibles, abusing the Religion of the People and heaping Calumny on their Clergy, promising Bribes in the Shape of Clothes and Money to the naked and half-starved People of Achill, exhibiting Pictures representing a Mouse gnawing the Sacrament of the Eucharist, supplied with Scales for the Purpose of weighing the consecrated Host (a new Experiment indeed, and worthy the enlightened Mind of the saintly Nangle), forcing Controversy on the ignorant Peasants, &c. &c. &c. until Mr. Nangle has by these and similar unwarrantable Means completely succeeded in destroying the Peace, Harmony, and Christian Feelings for which Achill, until his Arrival, in the worst of Times was remarkable and distinguished. These Emissaries of Discord coming thus armed in constant Collision with Kean, O'Donnell's Predecessor at the Dugorth National School, succeeded in making him a Convert to their Opinions, and instead of 8*l.* a Year from the Board, he has now secured 20*l.*, the usual Salary of a Preacher, or more properly speaking a public Disturber. The Head Controvertists under Mr. Nangle met O'Donnell, forced Controversy upon him ; he, unlike Kean, was able to meet and refute them ; they could not then hope to make him abandon his Religion ; he could not be bribed or bought, for he is a sincere Catholic and edifies the People by his virtuous, moral, and exemplary Life ; he is therefore an obnoxious Character, a marked Man, and must be removed, cost what it will ; this accounts for Mr. Nangle's Ire and Persecution. I make this Statement advisedly ; I pledge myself to prove what I advance, and under these Circumstances I hope that the Board and you, Sir, will honourably acquit poor O'Donnell. I have trespassed too long on your Time and Patience ; my Apology is that I feel interested in your Decision, for should the Enemy of Order and Peace succeed in this Instance he will readily adopt the same Course of Annoyance against the other Teachers, and I may then close up all my Schools, and leave the People of Achill, as I found them, ignorant and uneducated. The Board will, I am sure, come to no hasty Decision. Should this Statement be not satisfactory all I require for O'Donnell is a fair Trial, and this I have no Doubt will be readily granted.

" I remain, Sir,
Your obliged and obedient Servant,
MARTIN CONNOLLY, P.P.
Achill."

" Thomas F. Kelly, Esq."

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

" Rev[d] Sir, Education Office, 7th November 1835.

" I have received and submitted to the Commissioners of Education your Letter of the 25th Ultimo, relative to the Charge which had been alleged against the Teacher of the Dugorth School, and the Circumstances and Facts put forward by you, after due Examination, in refutation of it, and I have also submitted to them the Report of their Inspector, who had received their Directions to inquire into and report on this Subject; they desire me to state in reply that having fully considered the Documents, they are perfectly satisfied that the Charge has been made in Error or through great Misrepresentation, and accordingly see no Reason for removing O'Donnell from his Office.

" They request that you will from Time to Time give such Attention to this and the other National Schools in Achill as your other Avocations will admit of, in order that the Rules of the Commissioners may in all respects be strictly adhered to.

" I remain, Sir,
" Rev. M. Connolly, Your very obedient Servant,
Achill, Newport Pratt." Tho[s] F. Kelly."

(Copy.) Secretary's Letter to Mr. Kelly, Inspector.

" My dear Sir, 17th October 1835.

" Many Circumstances have occurred which render your immediate Visit to the National Schools of the Island of Achill absolutely imperative. Complaints have been forwarded of the Master of Dugorth School by the Reverend Mr. Nangle of that Island, upon Two several Occasions.

" Upon the latter Occasion this Gentleman accuses O'Donnell of threatening with a Knife to cut off the Head of any Child that would go to Mr. Nangle's School.

" I have written to the Reverend Mr. Connolly with respect to these Complaints, but the Board are of Opinion that your personal Visit, and your Explanation of the Principles of their National System, will be productive of much Good. I have to remind you that these Schools have never yet had the Benefit of an Inspection; although aided by the Board, there is therefore every Thing for you to do. I am also to remind you that Sectarianism as well as Political Animosity rage very much in these Islands; you will therefore so conduct yourself, that, in asserting the Principles of National Education, and setting Opinions right concerning it, you steer clear of giving Offence to any Side. I shall expect your Report in the Beginning of the ensuing Week.

" I am, &c. &c. &c.
(Signed) T. F. Kelly, Sec[y]."

(Copy.) Secretary to Mr. Kelly, Inspector.

" My dear Sir, 7th June 1836.

" When visiting the Achill Schools in October last relative to certain Charges made by the Reverend Mr. Nangle, can you upon your Recollection state whether you visited this Gentleman previous or subsequently to this Investigation? You state in your Letter of that Month that you waited upon him. An immediate Answer is requested.

" I remain, &c. &c.
(Signed) T. F. Kelly, Sec[y]."

(Copy.) Secretary to Mr. Kelly, Inspector.

" 9th June 1836.

" The Commissioners of Education request you will reply by Return of Post to the following Queries, viz. Inquire what passed between you and the Reverend Mr. Nangle? Did Mr. Nangle say that he could prove any Facts if Time were allowed to him to produce Witnesses, or did he say that he had any Witnesses, or did he complain that he had not Notice of the Inspector's Intention to visit the School?

" I am, &c. &c.
(Signed) T. F. Kelly, Sec[y]."

(Copy.)

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

(Copy.) Mr. Kelly, Inspector, to the Secretary.

" My dear Sir, Tuam, 11th June 1836.

" At the Time of my Visit to Achill I fully investigated the Charges made against O'Donnell the Teacher of the Dugorth National School, and examined all the Witnesses concerned in those Charges, and reported to the Board the Result.

" Mr. Nangle regretted he did not know of my Intention of calling upon him, and stated that he would have had all the Persons connected with these Matters to meet me. I however met his Objections by telling him that I would accompany him to their several Houses; we accordingly went to the Places where the Persons were engaged at the Time. Mr. Nangle afterwards stated that had he had Notice of my Visit he would have had the Matter arranged. I could not judge on what Grounds he made this Assertion, as he did not say that any of his Witnesses were unproduced; on the contrary, I accompanied Mr. Nangle across the Island, a Distance of Three or Four Miles, in order to meet One of the Parties. From all those Circumstances I feel assured that all the Persons concerned in the Matter were before me. In my Report I stated fully to the Board the Substance of my Interview with Mr. Nangle, which was confined to the Matter before the Board.

" I remain, &c. &c.

" To Thos F. Kelly, (Signed) James Kelly."
&c. &c. &c."

(Copy.) Secretary to Mr. Kelly, Inspector.

" My dear Sir, 18th July 1836.

" A Letter received from Mr. Nangle repeats the Charge against O'Donnell of his being dismissed from the Coast-guard for using seditious Language, and also, for the first Time, brings forward a Charge against Cassidy, the Teacher of the Duiga School. I give the Extract with regard to both from his Letter, it is as follows, viz.

" I have also to complain of the Conduct of Cassidy, the Teacher of the " National School in Duiga, also in this Island. When my Colleague, the " Reverend Mr. Baylee, was assaulted in that Village and pelted with Stones, " the Pupils of the National School came out of their School-house, and " took an active Part with the Assailants, Cassidy's own Son being amongst " the most forward, and though Cassidy himself stood by, he never " attempted to reprove or restrain them; the same Individual set on a Number " of Men to hoot after me with most abusive Language when I travelled " along the public Road at the Village of Cashel. 2. As to O'Donnell, the " Teacher of the Dugorth National School, I have ascertained that he was " dismissed from the Coast-guard Service as, I have stated in a former Letter, " for making seditious Speeches; and as the Truth of the other Charges " which I brought against him is perfectly well known in the Island, his " Continuance in the Employment of the Board is naturally regarded by " many as a Sanction, or at least a Connivance at Outrage."

" Mr. Nangle further requests that he may get previous Notice of the Arrival of the Inspector there, in order that he may attend with his Witnesses, and he also requests that the Report of the Inspector may be attested by a Magistrate or other respectable Person. I have by this Night's Post told him that you have been under Orders for this Island; and that by this Post I desire you to wait upon him immediately on your Arrival, and to open your Inquiry with whatever Assistance in the Investigation he may choose to offer; *but that you were to make the Report to the Commissioners.* I now beg to remind you that you are an Officer in the Confidence of the Board, and that were you not so you would cease to be One, therefore your Report comes *attested* as *usual* by *no Name excepting your own;* it is also *confidential,* made to the Board, and to *them only;* the Magistrate or any other respectable Person, or Mr. Nangle, may also, if they please, make their Report, but yours only is confidential; it was not thought fit that I should write these Matters to Mr. Nangle, it is sufficient to inform you.

" Now, my dear Sir, your Situation is delicate and difficult, but with *good Sense* and *Temper* you will steer through. Cassidy's Case is the easier of the

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Two; receive openly every Charge, and let them not say you refused any Witness; O'Donnell's is somewhat of a *more difficult* Nature. In September or October last Mr. Nangle stated that he was *informed* of his Dismissal, he now states that he has *ascertained* it; on the former Occasion it did not seem to be necessary to examine a *Hearsay*, but now he states a *Fact*, keep therefore back the Matter of the Affidavit which I sent you upon Saturday, and observe Silence as to it. If the Inquiry prove O'Donnell's Innocence then follow my Instructions of Saturday, otherwise do not. You may have to do in this Case with heated Partisans perhaps, on both Sides, but never forget that the Character of the Board is involved in your Mode of dealing openly with all, and taking part with nothing but Truth; you had better therefore give Two Days Notice of your Day of Investigation, and it may be best to let this "Two Days Notice" be served the Day *previous* to your Arrival, so that like a Judge you may open your Court in perfect Ignorance of all Evidence, until it come fairly before you; be sure, however, that you serve the Notice, and are able to prove the Service. Patrick Nolan of Cashel National School the Board has dismissed, he having been convicted at a Petty Sessions of an Assault. Should Mr. Nangle ask after him you can tell him this.

"I am, &c. &c.
T. F. Kelly, Sec^{y}."

"Minute of Conversations between Rev. Mr. Carlile and Mr. Dombrain.

"Mr. Carlile had a Conference with Mr. Dombrain on the Subject of the Dismissal of the Schoolmaster O'Donnell, when Mr. Dombrain stated that he had no Record or Notice of any Inquiry respecting O'Donnell or of his Dismissal, but added that as it appeared that O'Donnell was employed merely as a Supernumerary, the Officer on the Spot had full Power to dismiss him without any formal Inquiry, and without reporting to the Coast-guard Office."

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Rev. E. Nangle.

The Reverend EDWARD NANGLE is called in, and examined as follows:

You are settled in the Isle of Achill, which is an Island off the Coast of Mayo?
I am.

What induced you to settle there?
The extreme Destitution of the Inhabitants in every point of view, both Temporal and Spiritual.

When did you settle there?
I arrived in the Island in July 1834.

In what Character did you settle yourself,—as a Clergyman of the Established Church, or merely as an ordinary Inhabitant?
As a Clergyman.

Did you undertake to give Spiritual Ministrations there?
Yes.

Had you the Sanction of His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam for what you did?
I had not only his Grace's Sanction, but his warm Approval.

Is his Grace's Handwriting known to you?
It is.

[A Letter is shown to the Witness.]

Is that Letter in the Handwriting of the Archbishop?
It is.

The

Rev. E. Nangle.

The Letter is delivered in, and the following Passage is read:

"Although Mr. Nangle is neither Rector nor Curate of Achill, he is acting there entirely under my Sanction. He was sent down there by a Body of pious Men who formed themselves into a Society called the Achill Mission Society, by whom he is supported. Before he was commissioned to that Place I was consulted whether I would receive him as One of my Clergy under my Episcopal Supremacy. I was but too thankful for the Offer of such a Man's Services in that dark Spot in my Diocese, and gladly embraced the Offer, and would then, or at any Time since, or now (if he wished it), grant him my formal Licence, having always had one virtually. The Fruits resulting from this faithful Man's Labours (notwithstanding all the Opposition and Persecution he endures) amply bear me out in the Confidence I had placed in him. He is a most valuable, devoted, faithful, single-eyed Servant of the Lord. The Incumbent of Achill is an infirm Man, quite incapable of active Duty; he is also a very poor Man; his Income out of this Parish of Achill is only 100*l.* per Annum, out of which he could not be expected to pay a Curate."

Is the Rector of Achill resident in the Island?
He is not.

Is there any Glebe House in the Island?
There is not.

Is there any Glebe belonging to it?
No.

Was there any Church when you first went there?
No Church.

Have you since received a formal Licence of the Archbishop of Tuam?
I have.

With what Success were your Endeavours crowned in the Island at first; what were you able to do generally?
In reply to this Question, I shall just describe the present State of the Mission; we have now altogether connected with our Mission Thirty-four Families resident at our Settlement.

In one particular Part of the Island?
Upon our Mission Ground.

Which does not comprise the Whole of the Island?
Only a very small Part of it; Twenty-seven of those Families are Persons who have come out of the Church of Rome, and joined themselves to the Protestant Church, and either Eighteen or Nineteen of those Families have been brought out of the Church of Rome within the last Two Years and a Half since I went to the Island; and we have now in our Two Schools, a Male and a Female School, Eighty Children receiving Scriptural Instruction. As regards temporal Things, we have reclaimed about Thirty-two Acres of our Land, which was all wild Moor, and made it productive.

Are the Houses that have been built of a very superior Order to those which you found in the Island?
There was never a Slated House seen in the Island till we erected them. Several of our Buildings; our little Church, our Schoolrooms, my own Dwelling, are slated.

You have a Church there?
We have.

At the Time when there were most Scholars in your School, in which you say the Bible was read, what was the greatest Number of Scholars which you ever had in those Schools?
I can state the Number that we had in actual Attendance. I do not speak now

Rev. E. Nangle.

now of the Number upon our Books, but the Number in actual Attendance at one Time, and I speak from my own actual Observation. We had in the School at Dugorth 160 Children, in the School at Slevemore 140, at Cashel Eighty, and at Keel Forty; making a Total of 420.

You say you had that Number; when was this?
This was in the Spring of 1835.

What Number have you now?
We have now only Two Schools at Dugorth, and in the Two Schools we have Eighty Children.

The Children at both taken inclusive are only Eighty?
Only Eighty.

To what do you attribute this falling off?
I attribute it to the violent Persecution of the Roman Catholic Priesthood, as detailed in a Petition presented to the House of Lords by the Bishop of Exeter.

A Petition from you?
Yes.

Have you reason to know whether there is a greater Number of Children educated now, taking into Account both those educated in your Schools and those educated in the other Schools in the Island, than there were when first you went there?
I know that the Number has considerably diminished in the National School at Dugorth; I speak from personal Inspection of that School; the Number in actual Attendance is Twenty-three. The Number at Keel, and I speak here from the Report of my Colleague the Reverend Mr. Baylee who inspected this School, the Number is Sixty; the Number at the Village of Duiga is Sixty, and the Number in Cashel Twenty; I speak in reference to this latter School from the Report of the Country People. I could not visit it myself from fear of personal Violence, as I have been often insulted and ill-treated at the Village.

Then the whole Amount of Children now receiving Instruction in those Schools which have superseded yours, and yours together, amounts to 243?
Exactly.

Whereas before it was 424?
That is my Statement.

Are those Schools which you have last enumerated National Schools?
Yes, they are.

Are those Schools so situated as to interfere with yours?
They are all so situated, with the Exception of One; that is, the School at Duiga.

With that Exception, are there any National Schools in other Parts of the Island?
I am not aware of any.

So that your Impression was, that those were set up in opposition to yours?
Yes; I entertain no Doubt upon that, inasmuch as other Villages greatly needing Schools were left without any.

Had you ever Occasion to complain to the Board of National Education for any thing whatever?
Yes, I have had frequent Occasions to complain, both of the Persons employed as Teachers, and also of the Parish Priest who acts as Patron to the National Schools in the Island of Achill.

Will you state what was the first Occasion on which you made a Complaint? *Rev. E. Nangle.*
The first Occasion on which I made a Complaint was on the 8th of September 1835.

Is that No. 3. in the printed Returns?
It is.

You there seem to make Two Charges, and also to state a Thing for the Information of the Board against O'Donnell which did not concern you?
Yes.

With reference to the Complaint, the first appears to be, "I beg leave to inform you, that James O'Donnell, Master of the Dugort National School, in this Island, headed a Procession carrying Flags and Banners which went to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Arrival in this Place. O'Donnell bore a Flag with the Inscription, "Welcome Religion and Liberty," which was sufficiently intelligible to all who knew that Dr. M'Hale is a Bishop of the Church of Rome and the Advocate of Repeal. This illegal Procession was mustered and marshalled by O'Donnell's Exertions, for until his coming to the Place the poor People were happily preserved from the evil Contagion of Party Politics."
That is the first Charge.

Did you see this Procession?
I saw the Persons as they were returning from the Procession bearing One of the Banners; I did not actually see the Procession going out, but I saw them returning from it.

Upon that Banner that you saw, what was the Inscription?
It was as stated in this Letter, "Welcome Religion and Liberty." There was also — I did not think it necessary to state it in my Letter—but there was also upon it, "In hoc signo vinces," and a Cross drawn upon it.

Was the Cross connected with "In hoc signo vinces"?
Yes, it was, evidently; the Inscription had evidently reference to it.

Who was carrying that Banner?
I can only state that from Hearsay.

Was it O'Donnell?
I am firmly persuaded that it was O'Donnell, because it was so reported.

Do not you know O'Donnell's Person?
I do, but I stated that I did not see the Procession going out; it was returning when I saw it; it was a Boy that carried the Banner then.

When was this Letter attended to?
I have the Answer to it here. No. 4 is the Answer to it.

Will you read the Beginning of the Second Paragraph?
"The Transaction respecting O'Donnell, as alleged, they will have investigated."

Was Investigation ever made?
It was, but not until I had written another Letter on the 9th of October 1835.

Pressing for an Investigation?
Yes.

That Letter stated some other Fact, it appears?
It did.

Was that Letter acknowledged by Mr. Kelly?
Yes; we have the Acknowledgment here, No. 6.

Was an Investigation then granted?
Yes; the Inspector of the National Board, Mr. Kelly, visited our Settlement; he called upon me the 21st of October 1835.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Have the Board ever communicated to you their Decision upon the first Charge, that of O'Donnell's having been concerned in this Procession?
No; they never communicated any Decision to me.

Now, with respect to the Second Charge; will you read that Second Charge?
"Dr. M'Hale before his Departure from the Island thought fit to curse some of the Peasantry who had left the Church of Rome and joined themselves with us as Members of the Protestant Church. He forbid their Roman Catholic Neighbours to speak to them, or hold any Intercourse with them in the way of Courtesy or Traffic. O'Donnell is a zealous Agent for enforcing these unsocial Commands. On Sunday last, seeing one of the Islanders conversing with one of our People, he reproved him for holding any Communication with an accursed Heretic, asking him, 'Was he not aware that he himself came under the Priest's Curse for so doing.'"

Was there any Communication ever made to you of the Board's Decision respecting that Charge?
No, I do not recollect that there was.

Did the Inspector, when he came, inquire into either of those Charges?
He did not. I offered to produce Witnesses to substantiate the Truth of the first Charge, and he told me it was needless, because O'Donnell acknowledged that Charge to be true.

Then does not that show that he did investigate the Charge; how could that Acknowledgment have been made unless the Inspector had first asked the Question?
He must of course have received his Information from O'Donnell.

Then, upon the first Charge, had you Reason to know that the Inspector made Inquiry?
He must have made Inquiry from O'Donnell, when he stated to me that O'Donnell admitted his Guilt.

He told you that O'Donnell admitted his Guilt?
He did.

Then that was the Reason why it was not necessary to have any further Inquiry upon that Head?
Yes.

And yet the Board never gave you their Decision upon it, although the Inspector told you that O'Donnell had admitted the Fact to him?
No, they never did.

Now, with regard to that Second Charge, in that Letter of the 8th of September,—that which related to O'Donnell's being a zealous Agent for enforcing the unsocial and uncharitable Commands of Dr. M'Hale,—did you ever offer to produce any Testimony to the Inspector upon that Subject?
I told the Inspector that it was impossible for me to do so on that Occasion, as he had given me no previous Notice of his Intention to visit me, and the Persons on whose Testimony I relied to prove it were not in the Island at the Time.

Have you subsequently gone anywhere in the Island to see Persons who would prove any thing upon that Subject?
Not upon that Subject.

Subsequently did an Occasion arise for your having an Inquiry into the Second Charge?
No; there was no Investigation.

Not upon any subsequent Visit of the Inspector at the Island?
No.

With regard to the Third Point; will you read that?
"I have been since informed, that O'Donnell was once in the Coast-guard, but that he was dismissed on account of being implicated in Ribbonism. The Board

Rev. E. Nangle.

Board can readily inform themselves on this Point, by reference to Mr. Dombrain, Inspecting Commander of Coast-guard. As to the Charges which I have brought against O'Donnell, I am prepared to prove them before any Tribunal."

Do you know from any Communication made to you from the Board, whether the Board took any Steps to inform themselves upon this Subject?
No; they made no Communication to me upon the Subject.

Did you ever recur to this Third Charge against O'Donnell?
Yes, I did.

When?
"As to O'Donnell, the Teacher of the Dugort National School, I have ascertained that he was dismissed from the Coast-guard Service, as I stated in a former Letter, for making seditious Speeches; and as the Truth of the other Charges which I before brought against him is perfectly well known in the Island, his Continuance in the Employment of the Board is naturally regarded by many as a Sanction or at least a Connivance at Outrage."

What was the Date of that Letter?
The 13th of July 1836.

Was this Charge which was thus again pressed upon the Attention of the Board by you ever noticed by them in any Communication to you?
No, it was not noticed in any Communication; except in a verbal Communication from the Inspector.

Look at No. 14., the last Line but Two?
"And also for the Cause of the Dismissal of O'Donnell from the Coast-guard."—"I have to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of the 13th Instant, and in reply am to state that Mr. Kelly the Inspector, who has been under Orders to repair to Achill this Week upon the Business of the Board, has received Instructions by this Night's Post to wait upon you, upon his Arrival there, in order to receive any Assistance which you may think proper to give him in the Investigation of the Charges brought forward by you against Cassidy the Teacher of the Doega National School; and also for the Cause of the Dismissal of O'Donnell from the Coast-guard. Mr. Kelly will then report the Result to the Commissioners for their Decision on these Matters."

Look at No. 16.; what is the Date of that?
The 6th of August 1836.

Will you read the last Clause but one?
"With respect to what you allege against O'Donnell, as the Commissioners are given to understand that you intend to forward to them a certain Document in support of your Allegation, I am to say that they postpone at present expressing their Opinion in expectation of its Arrival."

Did you ever recur to this Matter?
In No. 17. there is a Reference to it again.

What is the Date of No. 17?
The 22d of August 1836.

Will you read that Reference of which you now speak?
"In reference to O'Donnell (the Teacher of Dugort National School), I need not say any thing in confirmation of the Truth of the Charge which I have brought against him, as Captain Irwin has already furnished you with the amplest Proof."

After that did the Board ever communicate to you their Decision relative to this Matter?
I do not recollect that they did.

In your Letter of the 9th of October 1835, No. 5., you made another Charge against O'Donnell; will you read that Charge?
"I allude to his Attempt to enforce the Prohibition which the Parish Priest uttered against any Communication being held by his Flock with Members

Rev. E. Nangle.

of my Congregation; and in addition to this I have now to complain, that he has endeavoured, by the Use of the most violent and threatening Language, to hinder Children from coming to my School; with a Knife in his Hand he threatened "to take the Head off One of our Scholars, because he came to our School."

Did the Inspector, when he came, inquire into this Matter?
He did. As I have before mentioned, I was taken altogether by Surprise, and the Child alluded to here, and also the Father of the Child, were at a Distance from our Settlement of about Four Miles. I went there in company with the Inspector in order to examine them on the Subject of my Charge.

Did you find them?
We did.

Can you mention what passed in the Inquiry?
We first of all called the Father of the Child, and he told the Inspector just what is stated in this Letter, that his Child informed him on his Return from School one Day, that he met O'Donnell, the Teacher of the National School in Dugort, and that he threatened him as described in my Letter; we then called the Child, for he was not with his Father at the Time we spoke with him; we found him a very intelligent Boy, of about Nine or Ten Years of Age; he related the Occurrence between him and O'Donnell as described by his Father, and the Observation of the Inspector was this, "this is quite satisfactory, and I shall report to the Board accordingly." I can positively swear that he made use of Expressions to that Purpose; I will not state that those were the very Words that he uttered, but the Expression was to the Purport, that the Evidence of the Fact was quite satisfactory.

Satisfactory as proving it?
As proving it.

Did he say whether he thought that the Board would take any special Course with regard to O'Donnell in consequence of that?
He did not.

Did the Board make any Communication to you of their Decision upon this Complaint?
Yes; we have the Decision here, in No. 7., the 9th of November 1835. "They find that this Charge is supported by the Evidence of the Accuser only, Michael M'Ginty, a Child of Nine Years of Age, the elder M'Ginty being merely a Narrator of what this Child had told him. On the other Side they find that there is the most direct Proof, not only that O'Donnell did not use the Words alleged in the Charge at all, but that it was another Person who used them. They cannot but place the utmost Reliance upon the Fidelity of the Report made to them upon this Case by their Inspector, and also upon the concurrent Testimony forwarded to them by the Patron of the School."

Will you look now at No. 23. in Page 16.; what is the Date of that?
The 24th of October 1835.

Read the first Sentence of it?
"My dear Sir,—According to your Instructions I have visited the Schools in this Island, Reports of which I herewith forward, and investigated the Charges preferred against O'Donnell, Teacher of the Dugort National School."

Read what he there says of the Third Charge?
The Third Charge states that O'Donnell threatened "to cut off the Head of a Child going to Mr. Nangle's School if he persisted in so doing." I examined the Child so threatened. Michael M'Ginty, Nine Years of Age, declares, that going One Day to Mr. Nangle's School he met O'Donnell, who threatened to cut off his Head if he went there any more. Andrew M'Ginty, Father to the Child, states that he returned Home, and told him the Conduct of O'Donnell.

There

191

Rev. E. Nangle.

There is another Clause which follows, which has Relation to that Charge?
"With respect to the Two first Charges, they are admitted. The Evidence of the Parties on the Third I should be inclined to receive with much Caution, as I am sure that slight Inducements would be sufficient to cause the People of this Island, where party and political Feeling rages to such an Extent, to deviate from the Truth."

Are you quite confident, so as to have no Particle of Doubt in your Mind, that this Inspector, when he examined these Witnesses with you upon this Point, said that this was quite satisfactory?
I am perfectly confident that he expressed himself to that Purport. I cannot just say that those are the very Terms he made use of, but certainly that was the Signification of the Terms he did employ.

Will you now look again at No. 7., and read what the Board says there in a Letter from Mr. Kelly?
"They find that this Charge is supported by the Evidence of the Accuser only, Michael M'Ginty, a Child of Nine Years of Age, the elder M'Ginty being merely a Narrator of what this Child had told him. On the other Side they find that there is the most direct Proof, not only that O'Donnell did not use the Words alleged in the Charge at all, but that it was another Person who used them. They cannot but place the utmost Reliance upon the Fidelity of the Report made to them upon this Case by their Inspector, and also upon the concurrent Testimony forwarded to them by the Patron of the School."

Will you look again at 23.; do you find that the Inspector's Report on the Third Charge is in conformity to that Statement that Mr. Kelly makes of it, or contradictory to it?
Mr. Kelly speaks here of "the most direct Proof," and I find no Proof in the Inspector's Reports, except a very ungenerous and unfounded Insinuation be considered such.

Will you read what is said upon the Fourth Charge in No. 23.?
"The Fourth Charge is, that O'Donnell sent a Message by One of his Scholars to his Sister, declaring that if she went to Mr. Nangle's Night School he would be before her, and thereby endeavour to prevent her so doing. This Charge has not been sustained, as on my questioning Edward Mangan or Lavelle, he declared that O'Donnell did not say so, but that he told her from himself, in order to deter her from attending Mr. Nangle's School."

Does any other Mode strike you of making intelligible what Mr. Kelly in No. 7. says than by supposing that these Two Matters were huddled together by the Board?
Mr. Kelly seems to have huddled the Two Cases together, and to have made a Statement concerning the Third Charge which belonged more properly to the Fourth Charge.

When was the Fourth Charge made?
That Fourth Charge was made after Mr. Kelly the Inspector's Arrival in the Island of Achill.

Did you take any Measures to prove that Fourth Charge?
I did.

What Course did you take?
The young Woman alluded to there lived as Servant in the House of One of the Coast-guard, in the Village of Dugort, and I proposed to Mr. Kelly to go up to the Coast-guardman's House in order to investigate it. Mr. Kelly told me, that this Coast-guardman, whose Name is Jones, had spoken to him already on the Business, and that he denied altogether the Facts contained in the Charge against O'Donnell. This surprised me very much, but on going up to Jones's I found Jones's Statement directly contradictory to the Statement of Mr. Kelly the Inspector.

Was Mr. Kelly with you at the Time?
He was.

Rev. E. Nangle.

What did Jones then say?

He stated that this young Woman had received a Message by her Brother from O'Donnell, the Teacher of the Dugort School, that if she persisted in coming to our Night School he would meet her on her Way home. I should mention to your Lordships, that the Daughter of this Jones, the Coast-guard-man, also attended our Night School, and as this was the Case, Jones, in order to protect his own Child, accompanied the young Woman home from the School, and O'Donnell did meet them, as threatened.

How do you know that?

Because I heard it stated by Jones, on the Investigation held in the Presence of Mr. Kelly.

Did any thing else happen in the course of that Investigation?

Yes; we went over to another Village to find out Edward Mangan (the Boy referred to in the Inspector's Report). Edward Mangan equivocated very much, and was evidently unwilling to tell the Truth. As we were speaking to him, his Sister (not the Female who attended our School) came to the Door of the Cabin, and spoke to him in Irish; she called him in, and told him not to answer any of our Questions.

Did you hear that?

Yes, I was present.

Do you understand Irish?

I do.

Sufficiently to be able to repeat the Substance of a Conversation that takes place?

Yes.

Are you able to preach in Irish?

Yes; I preach every Sunday in Irish.

And you heard what passed in Irish from the Girl to the Boy?

Yes.

What did pass?

After she had called the Boy into the House, she said, "We do not wish that my Sister should go to that School at all; for," said she, "is not the Parish Priest cursing her every Sunday in the Chapel for doing so, and do not the People of the Village say that they will come and cut her up in Quarters, and pull down the House over her Head." Mr. Kelly the Inspector was present, and as he did not understand Irish I told a Countryman that stood by to translate for him what the Woman had said. He translated it just as I have now related it to your Lordships in the Hearing of Mr. Kelly, and I then particularly remarked to Mr. Kelly, that he might learn from what he had heard who were the Persons that were disturbing the Peace of the Country.

In the Inspector's Report, No. 23., will you read what is said beginning with, "The Teacher placed at the Dugort School"?

"The Teacher placed at the Dugort School by Mr. Connolly, previous to the School being recognized by the Board or O'Donnell appointed, was tampered with, and finally brought over to Mr. Nangle's Side of the Question, upon which he placed O'Donnell there, on whom he could rely. The Result is, that Attempts have been made on him, and, failing those, Complaints have been lodged, not, I am sure, so much with a view to the general Good, as to injure him. From this Circumstance Mr. Connolly is naturally anxious to retain him."

Do you know this Teacher placed at the Dugort School by Mr. Connolly previous to the School being recognized by the Board; can you state his Name?

Yes; Philip Kane.

Do you know any thing of his having been "tampered with, and brought over to your Side of the Question"?

I am quite confident that if the Expression "tampered with" is intended to

Rev. E. Nangle.

to insinuate that any unworthy Motives were proposed to him as a Reason for changing his Profession of Religion, he never was tampered with.

Can you answer for that?
I can answer for it for myself.

But not for any body else?
I can, from my Knowledge of the Character and Principles of the Persons engaged in our Mission. I have the fullest moral Evidence of its Truth even as regards them.

You are at the Head of this Mission?
Yes.

And they would not like to take any Steps in such a Case without your Concurrence?
No; I am sure I should be consulted.

What Description of Persons have you under you in your Mission?
I have a Steward, I have also Four Persons employed as Scripture Readers, a Schoolmaster and a Schoolmistress, and I have a Colleague in the Ministry who acts as my Assistant.

And those are Persons for whose Integrity in this Matter you are sure you can answer?
Yes, I am.

They came to the Island with you?
They did.

None of those that you have under you in the Mission were Persons that you found in the Island when you arrived there?
No; none of those employed in the Work of the Mission.

When you state that you are confident that they were not tampered with, do you mean to say that you do not conceive that any improper Motives were held out to the Master of the School for leaving it?
Yes; that is what I meant to state.

Have you any Doubt then that the Master was induced by the Exertions of those Individuals to give up the School over which he had been placed?
I believe he was not spoken to at all in reference to the School.

Did he in point of fact give up the School?
He did not give up the School; he was shut out from the School. On the contrary, he was willing to have gone on teaching the School, in order to support himself, but he was not willing to teach the Roman Catholic Catechism, which he did not believe.

Then do you believe that Inducements were held out to him not to continue that System of Instruction which he had originally undertaken as Master of the School?
So far as I know, no Inducements were held out to him to discontinue his teaching in the School, for he was shut out from the School. He was willing to have gone on as the Teacher of the School.

But why do you understand that he was shut out from the School?
From what I learned from himself.

What Reason was there?
It was simply his becoming a Protestant.

But then do you believe that no previous Communications had been held with him which led to his becoming a Protestant, and at the same Time that he became a Protestant abstaining from the Course of Instruction which previously had been pursued in the School over which he was placed?
I am sure that several previous Communications were held with him. There were Conversations going on between him and our Scripture Readers on the Subject of the Points of Difference between the Church of Rome and the Church of England; but I do not know that their Conversations went beyond that.

Rev. E. Nangle.

The Question is, not whether their Conversation went to any other Subject, but whether the Subjects of their Conversation went to detach him from the Principles he had previously professed, and from the Mode of teaching he had used in the School?

I cannot state that they thought of the Situation that he occupied as Teacher. Their simple Object was to convince him of what they believed to be the Errors of the Roman Catholic Religion, and the Truth of the Protestant Religion.

Was it a National School that he was Master of?

It is denied here in this Report that it was a National School, but I have Reason to believe that it was a National School.

When you say it is denied, what do you mean?

"The Teacher placed at the Dugort School by Mr. Connolly, previous to the School being recognised by the Board or O'Donnell appointed." That says it was not a National School.

At the Time that he was shut out was it a National School?

At the Time that he was shut out I have Reason to believe that it was a National School.

And the Reason he gave for being shut out was, that he had refused to teach in it the Roman Catholic Catechism?

That he had just become a Protestant. What I stated was, that he was willing to have gone on as Teacher of that School provided he was not required to teach the Roman Catholic Catechism.

Did he say that the teaching of the Roman Catholic Catechism was imposed on him as Part of his Duty as the Teacher of that School?

It was always Part of his Duty to teach the Roman Catholic Catechism.

The Question is, not what you think to have been his Duty, but what he said he thought was his Duty. Did he say that he considered the teaching of the Roman Catholic Catechism as Part of his Duty at the School?

It was, and he considered it so.

Did he tell you so?

No.

Upon what Ground then do you say that he knew that it was Part of his Duty?

Because it was always taught in the School; it was always Part of his Duty as the Teacher of the School to teach it.

If he did not tell you so, how do you know that he had that Opinion?

I put myself in his Place, and I cannot understand how I or any intelligent Person occupying his Place could arrive at any other Conclusion.

Then you mean to say that if you had been in his Place you would have thought so?

Yes.

Have you any other Ground for believing that he thought so?

I suppose that any intelligent Person in the same Circumstances would arrive at the same Conclusion.

What Reason have you to believe that it was a National School?

There is the sworn Testimony of Philip Kane himself. He says, "If the Testimony of the Reverend Martin Connolly is to be believed, it was so, because the Reverend Martin Connolly of Achill told him that it was a National School."

Was the Word National School written up over the Door?

I cannot state whether it was then, but it is now.

What is your Reason for believing that it was a National School?

My Reason for believing it is the sworn Testimony of Philip Kane himself.

Upon what Occasion?

An Affidavit that I have brought over with me.

Have you got that Affidavit?
I have handed it over to the Bishop of Exeter.

Before whom was that Affidavit made?
Before the nearest Magistrate.

Upon what Occasion?
I brought Philip Kane before him, and had his Affidavit taken.

He did not swear that he knew of his own Knowledge that it was a National School?
No; he states it on the Testimony of the Patron of the School.

You stated it upon the Evidence of Kane, and he states it upon the Evidence of Mr. Connolly?
Yes.

What was the Date of Philip Kane giving up the School, or being turned out of it?
It was in July 1835.

How do you know that it was in July 1835?
I recollect well, because I was in London at the Time myself, and I received a Letter, informing me of the Master of the National School having become a Protestant.

Was there any thing in the History of that Man that made it peculiarly gratifying that he should have become a Protestant?
Yes, there was, inasmuch as he had been once very bitter against us, and was even convicted for committing an Assault upon some of the Children coming to our School.

Had he been punished for that?
He was convicted, but the Attorney employed for him stated that the Conviction was not legal, inasmuch as there was only One Magistrate on the Bench at the Time; the Conviction therefore was not carrried into effect.

Was it notorious in the Island that the Roman Catholic Catechism was taught in that School?
It was.

Where was he convicted of this which you say was not a legal Conviction?
It was at the Sessions at Newport.

In your Letter of the Thirteenth of July 1836 you allege serious Charges against the Patron of the National School at Achill, the Reverend Martin Connolly, the Parish Priest; will you read those Charges?
"I have also serious Charges against the Patron of National Education in this Island, the Reverend Martin Connolly, P. P. I can prove that he has ordered the People to shout after me and the Members of my Congregation whenever they see us; that he has endeavoured to establish, to our Injury, a System of exclusive dealing; and that he commanded the Members of his Congregation to assault any Person connected with this Settlement who should attempt to speak to them with the first Weapon which came to hand; either 'to knock them down with a Spade, or stab them with a Pitchfork;' and that he particularly marked as an Object for popular Vengeance a Man of most unblemished Character employed by me as a Schoolmaster, saying, from the Altar of his Chapel, 'There is that Devil, Murray, going through the Island, a Man who would not be suffered to live in any Place but Achill.'"

You made this Charge in your Letter of the 13th of July; how did the Board notice that Charge?
They took no Notice whatever of it in their Reply to my Letter.

When the Inspector came to the Island did he inquire into this Charge?
No, he did not inquire into it; I asked him particularly whether he was instructed to inquire into it, and he said he had received no Instructions upon the Subject.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Did you offer to prove it before him?
Of course not, when he said he was not instructed to carry on the Investigation; he declined inquiring into it.

Did you ever recur to this Charge in any of your Correspondence with the Board?
Yes, I did.

In what Part of it?
It is repeated again in my Letter of the 22d of August 1836, in Page 14. of the printed Correspondence. "Permit me again to repeat what I urged upon the Attention of the Board in a former Communication, that while the Board intrust the Administration of its Affairs in this Island to the Reverend Martin Connolly, P. P., the present Patron of their Schools, they can only expect a Succession of similar Persons in the Capacity of Teachers as Hoban and O'Donnell are proved to be. This is no hasty Assertion; the Board is already in Possession of the Grounds on which it is made; the Importance of the Matter will, however, excuse Repetition. Again, I distinctly state that I am prepared to prove that the Reverend Martin Connolly ordered the People to shout after me and the Members of my Congregation in general; that he endeavoured to establish, and did for a while establish, a System of exclusive dealing, to our Annoyance and Injury; that he commanded the Members of his Flock to assault any Person connected with this Settlement who should attempt to speak to them with the first Weapon which came to hand; either to knock them down with a Spade, or stab them with a Pitchfork; and that he particularly marked as an Object of popular Vengeance a Man of most unblemished Character employed by me as the Teacher of a Scriptural School, saying, from the Altar of his Chapel, 'There is that Devil, Murray, going through the Island, a Man who would not be suffered to live in any Place but Achill.'"

Did you send Copies of your Letter of the 22d of August 1836, containing a Repetition of this Charge to which you have now referred, to any of the Commissioners?
I did. I sent a Copy of it to His Grace the Duke of Leinster and His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and to the Rev. Mr. Carlile and Dr. Sadleir.

Did you receive any Answer from any One of the Commissioners to your Letter?
I received a simple Acknowledgment of my Letter from His Grace the Duke of Leinster; I received no Communication whatever from any of the others.

Did the Acknowledgment from His Grace the Duke of Leinster include an Acknowledgment of the Letter written to any other of the Commissioners?
No, it did not.

Are the Committee then to understand, that after your laying this grave Charge before the Board on July 13th, and their Inspector then omitting to inquire into it, and your recurring to it in the next Month, addressing the different Protestant Members of the Board upon it, and a Delay of noticing it for Two Months longer, that the Board at last took no Step whatever?
It remained unnoticed until the 10th October 1836; then I received a Letter from the Board in reply to my Letter of August.

There was no Acknowledgment then of this Part of your Letter as being in your Letter of the 13th of July?
No. Perhaps I should state that the truth of One of my Charges against the Rev. Mr. Connolly came out in the Inspection which the Inspector of the Board held at Doega.

In your Presence?
In my Presence.

What passed?
Mr. Connolly, the Parish Priest, was present at an Investigation held by the Board into the Conduct of One of their Masters, Cassidy, at Doega,

Mr.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Mr. Connolly was present, and there was an English Gentleman from Oxford, of the Name of Hill, also with me. I said to Mr. Connolly, "Now, Mr. Connolly, I charge you, in the Presence of the Inspector of the National Board and in the Presence of this English Gentleman, with having commanded your Congregation to shout after me and insult me as I go through the Island. Now, if that Charge be false I call upon you to deny it in their Presence." His only Observation was, "I am not going, Sir, to answer your Question."

The Board said something in another Letter upon this Subject, in No. 19. of the Correspondence of the 20th of October?
Yes; there is a Letter before that, in No. 18.: "I beg to apologize for the Error but this Morning discovered by me."

In that Letter they merely acknowledge your Letter of the 22d August?
Yes.

The real Answer to it is in the next Letter?
It is. "I have submitted to the Commissioners your Letter of the 22d August; they direct me to state in reply, that as it appears to them to relate to Matter properly cognizable by a legal Tribunal they have referred it to the Consideration of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant."

And it was in that Way that they disposed of the Complaint?
Yes; I never heard any more about it.

With respect to this Correspondence which passed between you and Mr. Carlile the Commissioner; had you long been known to him?
We were not very intimately acquainted; we had known each other in Dublin a good while before; I cannot exactly state how long.

In one of the Letters, where it is said that Kane had been tampered with, it is said that Attempts had been made on O'Donnell; do you know of any Attempts having been made of that Kind?
No. I know of no Attempts whatever having been made, except the Attempt that we honestly make on every Roman Catholic that we meet with, to convince him of the Error of the Roman Catholic Religion and the Truth of the Protestant Faith.

In what Form was that Attempt made upon this Man?
By an Appeal to the Scriptures, as the Rule which must decide the Points of the Controversy between us.

By whom was it made?
By several.

Was it made by yourself?
I do not know that I ever had a Conversation with him.

Do you know that any others have?
Yes; I have heard a Disputation upon Religious Subjects between O'Donnell the Schoolmaster and a Schoolmaster of our own.

Who was that Schoolmaster of your own?
Murray was his Name.

Where was it made?
It was on the public Road.

Did you bring Murray to the Island, or find him there?
We brought him to the Island.

Were there any Protestants in the Island when you went to Achill?
I am not aware of any, except the Protestant Coast-guard, and one Family in the Village of Doega, the Male Members of which acknowledged themselves Protestants.

Had you had any previous Communication with that Family, previous to your going to Achill?
I never knew of their Existence till I went into the Island.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Was it understood, when you went to the Island, or soon after, by the Inhabitants, that you came for the Purpose of reclaiming the Inhabitants from the Errors of Popery?

It was perfectly understood; we never made any Secret of our Object.

Did you not also go into the Island with a view to the destitute Condition of the Inhabitants in other respects?

Certainly; we conceived it to be our Duty as Christians to endeavour to do them Good in every Way we could.

But you do not wish it to be understood that you went there with reference to their destitute Condition, without coupling it with the reclaiming the Inhabitants from the Errors of Popery?

Certainly; we considered the reclaiming them from the Errors of Popery as the main Object of the greatest Importance, and the other as subservient to it.

And you so wished it to be understood, and it was so understood?

I suppose it was.

Is the Man named Murray the same Person mentioned in this Letter, No. 13., where it is said,—"There is that Devil, Murray, going through the Island, a Man who would not be suffered to live in any Place but Achill?"

Yes; it is the same Person.

Who is the Landlord of that Part of the Island?

Sir Richard O'Donnell.

Did he encourage you, or discourage you?

He encouraged us, by letting us have a Tract of wild Moor Ground on a Lease.

It appears, in the Letter No. 19., that the Commissioners referred the Matter therein adverted to to the Consideration of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant; had that Reference any Result that you are aware of?

No; I never heard any thing about it since.

Do they continue their Opposition through the Island now?

Yes, they do.

Have they appeared to be less indisposed towards you since the Investigation which was carried on by Order of the Board?

No; they are pretty much in the same State as usual; the People themselves are extremely kindly disposed when they are let alone.

What is the Police Force in the Island?

There are Six Men stationed at Cashel, a Village where the Patron of the National Education resides, which is the Centre of Disturbance in the Island.

How near to you?

About Four Miles.

When you say the Centre of Disturbance of the Island, do you mean of all Disturbances that take place, or any particular Disturbance?

It was from that Village that the Teacher of the National School, Hoban, was brought to be tried before the Magistrate for an Assault on Two Persons coming to our Settlement, and was convicted of the Assault; and it was passing by that Village that my Sister and my infant Children were assaulted and pelted with Stones by a furious Mob when going in their Jaunting Car along the public Road, and I myself can scarcely ever pass without being hooted, and sometimes pelted with Stones; and therefore I think I am justified in stating that it is the Centre of Disturbance.

From your Knowledge of the Island, has there been any serious Disturbance in the Island connected with other Subjects than that of the Mission?

I do not know of any Disturbance; the Natives of Achill are an exceedingly peaceably disposed People.

What

Rev. E. Nangle.

What is the Population of the Island?
I cannot exactly state; but I believe it to be Four or Five thousand.

How long have you been in the Island?
I settled in the Island first in the latter End of July 1834.

The Inspector says, in a Letter of his, that there is a great deal of Disturbance and excited Feeling in the Island; is that so?
Yes.

Was that so when you first arrived?
No, it was not; it was not so till the present Patron of National Education arrived.

How long after you came there did the present Patron of National Education come?
I cannot state accurately, but I think it was in the Spring of 1835.

Till then was all quiet in the Island?
No; I recollect that the Parish Priest before him also stirred up the People in a most violent Manner, as I have most certain Evidence of.

Stirred up the People in a most violent Manner in regard to what Subject?
In reference to our Schools, and also to ourselves.

You arrived in July 1834, and before the Spring of 1835 there was great Disturbance, and the People were much stirred up?
Yes.

Were there any Schools in the Island before you established your Schools?
There was no School except One; a pay School, attended by very few Children, as I understood.

Was that in the same Part of the Island where you were?
No; it was in a distant Part of the Island.

What do you suppose was the Cause of the Disturbance in the Island?
The Cause of the Disturbance was the Harangues that the People were in the habit of hearing in the Chapel.

What was the Subject of those Harangues?
Some of them are detailed here in the Complaint to the Board, in reference to the Reverend Martin Connolly the Parish Priest.

Were there any Harangues made in the Chapel by the Predecessor of the Reverend Mr. Connolly?
Yes; I have already stated that there were.

But you do not know of your own Knowledge?
I know it upon the Testimony of a respectable Roman Catholic in the Island.

How many Families have you now on what you call the Mission Ground?
We have altogether Thirty-four Families.

How many of those are old Inhabitants of Achill?
I could not state that.

Did not you say Twenty-seven?
I said that Twenty-seven of those Families had been brought from the Church of Rome, and I said that Eighteen or Nineteen Families had come out from the Church of Rome since we went to the Island.

Are any of the Coast-guard living on your Mission Ground?
There is one Coast-guard Man living on the Mission Ground.

Some of the other Families are Persons who came with your Mission?
Yes; but I stated that there were Thirty-four Families altogether living upon the Mission Ground, and that Twenty-seven of those Families were Persons who had been brought out from the Church of Rome; some of them came with us; and I also stated, that since we came into the Island Eighteen or Nineteen Families have been brought out from the Church of Rome.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Are those old Inhabitants of the Island?

They are not all old Inhabitants of the Island; they have congregated around us from various Parts.

What Conditions do you make with the People to whom you give Ground; do they work for you?

The Manner of our proceeding is simply this: we give a Cottage, and we give an Acre of reclaimed Ground, and for this they pay us a yearly Rent of *2l. 5s.*, getting constant Employment from us in reclaiming the rest of the Land; they are employed as our Labourers in reclaiming Land.

Are they all Protestants of the Church of England?

All the Persons living on our Mission Ground are, with the Exception of one Female.

Do you make that the Condition of Residence?

Yes; the Place is intended as a Refuge for Persons wishing to be protected from the Tyranny which every one acquainted with the State of Ireland knows is practised upon those Persons who leave the Church of Rome.

It is founded to provide Habitations for Persons who are converted from the Roman Catholic Religion to the Protestant?

Yes, and are suffering Persecution.

When you say suffering Persecution, do you make it a Rule that their Condition shall have been positively impaired in consequence of the Change of their Religious Faith?

There is no Occasion to make any such Rule, because it is invariably the Case, when Persons in Ireland leave the Church of Rome, that they are exposed to the most furious Persecution.

Do you make it a Rule or not?

No, we do not.

Do not you know that there are a great Number of Persons in Ireland that have no visible Means of Subsistence whatever?

There are a great Number in the Island of Achill in that Condition.

Are the Persons living on the Mission Ground there in that State?

No; I should be sorry to see them so; it is our Object to better their temporal as well as their spiritual Condition.

Therefore, a Person in the miserable Condition you have described in the Island of Achill, if he came upon your Ground would be in a better Condition?

No, I do not know that he would be in a better Condition upon the whole, for this Reason, that the Irish People are very hospitable, and always very charitable to those of their own Persuasion when they are suffering Distress; but as soon as ever a Man professes himself to be a Protestant the Stream of Kindness is cut off from him completely. The Sufferings of our poor People have been very great in consequence of the exclusive dealing established in the Island, and the Refusal even of their Fellow Countrymen to speak to them; frequently when they meet them on the Road they make the Sign of the Cross, saying, "The Cross of Christ be between me and Harm," and they draw back as if the Convert to Protestantism carried a deadly Pestilence about him.

Then you do not think that the worst Class upon your Mission Ground are in a better Condition than the worst Class of those who are in other Parts of the Island of Achill?

Our Object is to raise them in every Way, and certainly I conceive myself bound to use all my Endeavours to better the temporal Condition of those Persons who acknowledged themselves to be Members of the Protestant Church, and put themselves under my Protection; but it is hard to avoid Reproach; sometimes we are accused of being ready enough with our Preaching because it costs us nothing, but that we will not give any thing to the poor People; then when we strive to better their temporal Condition it is insinuated that we attempt to induce them to change their Religious Profession by Bribery.

Are

Are not the Persons who having become Converts are admitted upon that Ground into your Settlement in fact in a better Condition than the most destitute of the Catholic Population of the Island of Achill? *Rev. E. Nangle.*

They are in a better Condition, certainly.

You mean in a better Condition as to Provision, Clothing, and Habitation?
Yes.

Do you mean that they are in a better Condition in those respects, but that, from the Causes you have stated before, there are Evils attending their Condition which would prevent Persons coming hypocritically to pretend to be Protestants into your Settlement?
Certainly.

What are those Inconveniences?
The forfeiting the good Opinion of their Neighbours, their being called by abusive Names, and their being treated with personal Violence.

Have any Families left your Mission Ground?
Yes, they have.

Have they relapsed into the Roman Catholic Religion?
I cannot state that they have actually returned to the Church of Rome again; I can state that some Persons who left our Ground have entreated us to receive them back again.

You mentioned a Person of the Name of Philip Kane; does he live upon your Ground?
He does at present.

Is he a Native of Achill?
He is not; I believe he is a Native of the Town of Newport.

What was he by Profession?
I cannot state what he was till I saw him in Achill; he was employed there as a Schoolmaster by the Reverend Martin Connolly, the Patron of National Education.

In One of your Letters, No. 3., you state that O'Donnell, the Master you complained of, had been dismissed from the Coast-guard for being implicated in Ribbonism; who told you that?
It is notorious in the whole Country; I have heard it from several Persons; in fact it is a Matter of common Notoriety in the whole Country.

Did any Person that you specifically recollect ever tell you that O'Donnell had been dismissed for making seditious and disloyal Harangues?
Yes; I had it from a Man of the Name of Rutledge, the chief Boatman of the Coast-guard Station at Achill, who was in charge of the Station from which O'Donnell was dismissed, and I also had it in a Letter from Lieutenant Irwin.

Did you ever make any Inquiry upon the Subject of O'Donnell's Dismissal either from Mr. Dombrain or from Mr. Irwin?
I wrote to Mr. Dombrain on the Subject; he referred my Letter to Mr. Irwin, and he sent me back Mr. Irwin's Reply.

Do you recollect the Date of your Application and of that Reply?
No, I do not recollect the Date.

Do you happen to know whether that happened very early in August 1836?
I could not say.

In Mr. Kelly's Answer to your Letter, No. 16., in Page 12., in the last Paragraph but one, he says that you intend to forward a certain Document in support of your Allegation against O'Donnell; what was that Document?
As well as I can recollect now, my Intention was to have had Rutledge's Affidavit, and to have forwarded that to the Board.

In your Letter to the Commissioners you say, "In reference to O'Donnell," in Page 13., "I need not say any thing in confirmation of the Truth of the Charge which I have brought against him, as Captain Irwin has already

Rev. E. Nangle.

furnished you with the amplest Proof." How did you know that Captain Irwin had furnished that Proof to the Board?

When I wrote to Mr. Dombrain for Information upon the Subject of the Charge against O'Donnell, he sent my Letter to Captain Irwin, and Captain Irwin in his Reply, which Mr. Dombrain forwarded to me, said "I cannot do better, in replying to this Inquiry, than by sending you a Copy of the Letter which I have sent in answer to the same Question proposed to me by Mr. Kelly, the Secretary of the National Board of Education;" and in that Way I knew that Mr. Kelly was in Possession of Mr. Irwin's Testimony as to the Truth of my Charge.

Mr. Irwin sent to Mr. Dombrain a Copy of the Letter which he sent to Mr. Kelly, and he sent it to you?

Yes.

Is that the Letter which you find in No. 22. at the Bottom of Page 15?

It is.

Do you think that is ample Proof that this O'Donnell was discharged?

It was ample Proof to me, and for this Reason, that I had it in my Power perfectly to identify the O'Donnell dismissed from the Coast-guard with the O'Donnell that was teaching the School; I could do that by Rutledge, who was in Achill at the Time, and who had been in charge of the Coast-guard Station from which O'Donnell was dismissed; I could therefore establish the Identity of O'Donnell with the Person alluded to in Lieut. Irwin's Letter.

It was ample Proof therefore to you; but do you think, as it stood, it was ample Proof to the Commissioners?

I think that the Commissioners had quite sufficient Proof before them to lead them to press the Inquiry further.

Should you call the Evidence of one Timothy M'Carthy, a Boatman, sufficient Proof to dismiss a Person upon such a Charge as that, after an Interval of Four Years, from a Situation in which he was earning his Bread, with such a Stain upon his Reputation as would probably prevent his ever being employed in his professional Capacity again?

My Answer to that Question is simply this:—Mr. Irwin conceived that it was sufficient Ground for dismissing him from the Situation which he held in the Coast-guard; and therefore I should think it was decidedly a sufficient Ground to dismiss him from the Situation under the National Board.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 18° *Aprilis* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The Reverend EDWARD NANGLE is called in, and further examined as follows:

Will you have the goodness to refer to No. 2. in Page 4. of the Correspondence; there is a Letter from Mr. Carlile to you; in the Third Paragraph of that Letter he intimates to you that by taking part in the Management of the National School you could secure the Reading of the Scriptures to a great Portion of the Children: did you act at all in accordance with that Suggestion, or attempt to act so?

No, I did not.

Why not?

Because I could not in any Way whatever seem to signify my Approval of the National Board of Education by having the Schools under it or in connexion with it.

The Letter to which that is an Answer is marked No. 1, the Letter of the 10th of March; at the Time you wrote that Letter were there any National Schools established in the Isle of Achill?

I really cannot say at what Time the Schools were taken into connexion with the National Board; not being in correspondence with the Board I have no Means of obtaining the Information.

Do you recollect whether that Letter was written in apprehension of such Schools being established, or in consequence of the Schools being established?

It appears from the Letter itself that some Schools were established at the Time; whether they were in connexion with the National Board just at that Time I cannot say.

Does not the Letter rather express an Apprehension that Schools would be established that were not in existence. The Words are, that the Priest designs making Application for Schools to be set up?

In the Sentence before that I say, "as the Schools which he has established, and whose Existence he hopes to perpetuate by a Grant from the National Board."

Still there were no National Schools?

I certainly wrote that Letter under the Impression that the Schools were not at the Time actually taken into connexion with the National Board; but whether the Impression was right or wrong I cannot say.

Did you, when you came to the Island, find that the Catholic Clergyman had Schools in the Island?

No; those Schools were set up a very short Time before the Date of my Letter. There was no School when I came into the Island, except one Pay School. It was not till our Schools were established, and great Multitudes of Children had flocked into them, that those Schools were set up, as appears from this Letter.

You went to the Island in July 1834, and this Letter is dated March 1835, which leaves only about Seven Months for the Establishment either of your Schools or of the Priest's from the Time you came into the Island?

Yes, that is the Case.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Of course, in the Condition in which the Schools first were so set up with the Priest, you could not go into them at all, and did not?
No; I have no Right to go into them.

But you are aware that when they came under the National Board, it would have been within your Means to have had Access to those Schools to a certain Degree?
Yes; but I stated Yesterday that one of the National Schools in Achill I really dared not visit from Apprehension, not only of Abuse but personal Violence; for, as I stated, I have often been shouted after and pelted with Stones in passing by the Village in which that School is established.

Is there any Parochial Clergyman of the Established Church residing in the Island of Achill?
There is not, except myself and Mr. Baylee.

You consider yourself as a Parochial Clergyman?
Yes, I do, certainly, as acting under the Licence of the Archbishop of Tuam.

Do you receive any Salary from any Revenues belonging to the Church Establishment?
No, I do not.

Did you at any Time before?
Yes; I had been a Curate in the Established Church, receiving a Salary.

Where were you a Curate?
I was Curate in the Parish of Athboy in the Diocese of Meath, and I was Curate of Arvagh in the County of Cavan.

Did you give up that last Curacy for the Purpose of undertaking this Mission to Achill?
I was obliged to give it up several Years ago on account of ill Health, and it was on the Recovery of my Health that I went to Achill to spend my Days there.

By whom was this Mission established? Was it by the Archbishop of Tuam, or by Clergymen of the Established Church?
The Mission originated with myself first.

Did it not require considerable Funds to take those Lands where you were understood to say that some large Sums of Money were laid out?
Yes.

Were those Funds in any way derived from the Revenue of the Established Church?
No; they were all voluntary Contributions. There is a Committee in Dublin, and this Committee receive the Funds. They have a regular Treasurer, with whom the Funds are lodged, and the Disbursements are made by the Committee.

To what Purpose were those Funds appropriated?
The Support of Two Ministers at the Missionary Settlement, and the Support of the Land Steward, Scripture Readers, and School Teachers, and also the Erection of Buildings, and the reclaiming of Land.

Do the Operations or the Views of this Missionary Society relate to the Island of Achill alone, or to other Parts of Ireland?
The Society commenced with Achill; and now they purpose extending their Operations to other Parts of Ireland.

And under them you were sent to Achill?
Yes.

Are you remunerated from this Society?
Yes. I receive 150*l.* a Year.

What were the Instructions given to you?
I stated that my Object in going to Achill was to endeavour to better the People both in their Temporal and Spiritual Condition.

With

With respect to their Spiritual Condition,—to convert them from the Roman Catholic Religion to the Protestant?
Most decidedly.

Conversion, in short, was your Object?
Most decidedly.

When you actively took up that Object had you reason to believe that the Inhabitants of Achill were in a very demoralized Condition?
I had reason to believe that they were in a State of the most extreme Ignorance. Darkness in Spiritual Things and what I would call Immorality always go together.

Did you find them, in point of fact, in a State of great Crime?
I do not know that they are more remarkable for the Commission of gross Crime than any other Number of unregenerate Men.

Did you hear that there had been many Murders in the Island?
I heard of One Murder a short Time before I went into it.

Has any occurred since you have been there?
Not just in the Island of Achill; on the opposite Coast I have heard of some very dreadful Outrages.

Are they given to Robbery and Theft?
They are just as much as the Population of Ireland generally are. I should not wish to brand them as being Thieves above others; but they are destitute of the Knowledge of Christ, and that is a Thing that I view as a Matter of great Importance.

Did you find them much given to other Immorality?
I have already stated as regards Immorality, that I do not think they are worse, generally speaking, than the rest of the Population of Ireland ordinarily are.

Then when you went to the Island you found those People not remarkable for any Immorality or Crime; and you also found them, according to your Statement Yesterday, in Tranquillity; but now they are in a State of very excited Feeling, and considerable Disturbances have taken place in the Island lately?
Yes, considerable Disturbances have taken place; but I would couple that Admission with the most unqualified Statement of the Fact, that the Roman Catholic Priesthood have been the Means of exciting those Disturbances.

There has been a Roman Catholic Priesthood in that Island for a great many Years, has there not?
Yes.

For Centuries, perhaps?
I cannot tell how long. If your Lordships wish to press me upon the Statement I have made as to the Roman Catholic Priesthood being the Disturbers of the Public Peace in Achill I am prepared to bring forward Facts in confirmation of its Truth.

You said just now that you thought that Darkness in Spiritual Matters and what you call Immorality go together. What do you mean by that Immorality?
When I speak of Immorality I use the Term with reference to the Statements of Scripture, and I believe that every Man is living in Immorality who is living without a Knowledge of the true God, and not in subjection to him.

Then by the Word "Immorality," you do not mean the Guilt of an immoral Life,—Drunkenness or Debauchery, or any thing of that Sort; but you mean living in Ignorance of what you consider the true Faith?
And also living without the Exercise of right Affections in reference to God; not only having the Understanding darkened by Ignorance, but also living under the Power of an unsanctified Heart.

Rev. E. Nangle.

And that you think the necessary Consequence of being a Professor of the Roman Catholic Religion?

Yes; I believe that the Roman Catholic Religion is the Apostacy from the Christian Religion foretold in the Scriptures.

You went to Achill to convert those People from this immoral State?

I went there with the Desire of being an Instrument in the Hands of God to accomplish it.

Did you proclaim those Intentions?

I never made any Secret of them.

In what Way did you make them known?

By speaking to the People wherever I met them, telling them of what I believed to be the Errors of their Religion, and endeavouring to set before them what I believed to be the Truth.

Did you assemble them together for that Purpose, or did you only speak to them as you casually met One or Two in a Room?

Both. As many as I could I assembled, and when I could not assemble them I spoke to them as I met with them.

And you warned them against the Doctrines inculcated by their own Spiritual Advisers, their own Priests?

I did.

You told them that they were unregenerate?

That is not my Province; it is God who judges the Heart. I told them that Regeneration was necessary. I pointed out to them the Means by which Regeneration was to be obtained, but I did not take upon myself to judge the Individual.

You did not tell them that they were in a State of Unregeneracy?

I told them that so long as a Person lived in the Avowal of the Doctrines taught by the Church of Rome I could have no Evidence from the Scriptures of his being in a regenerate State. I made that general Statement, but I could not take upon myself to lay my Finger upon any Man, and say, you are unregenerate.

Did you warn them against the Doctrines that were preached by their own Priests?

Most decidedly I did. Your Lordships will recollect that I am a Minister of the Church of England, and when I received Ordination from the Hands of the Bishop I solemnly vowed, in the Presence of God, to "give Diligence to drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to God's Word." I, as a Minister of the Church of England, can have no Doubt as to the Doctrines of the Church of Rome being erroneous and strange Doctrines, and contrary to God's Word; and when I see the Mass, the leading Doctrine of Popery, described in the Thirty-nine Articles, which I have subscribed, as a "blasphemous Fable and dangerous Deceit," and in the Rubric as Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians, I would ask whether I could, as a Minister of the Established Church, having received Ordination from the Hands of a Bishop, and having subscribed to those Articles, and vowed to drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines, be silent on the Subject of Popery. I appeal to your Lordships Consciences whether I could be silent, and maintain that Consistency of Principle and Conduct which an honest Man must ever desire to maintain.

You did, in fact, warn them against the Doctrines that were inculcated by their Priests?

Yes, I have stated the Fact; I never shrunk from the Avowal.

And you thought yourself bound as a Protestant Clergyman by your Ordination Vow to do so?

I most decidedly did; I never had the slightest Shadow of a Doubt about it.

Does it strike you as an extraordinary Thing that those Priests against whom you warned their Flocks should feel some Hostility towards you who made

made a Point to represent their Doctrines to their Flocks in the Light in which you thought it your Duty to represent them?

I think that if they entertained any Hostility towards me on that Ground, at all events they are under the Censure of the National Board of Education, for I only wish to refer your Lordships to the "general Lesson" which those Priests are directed to post up in their Schools. I have therefore no Hesitation to say, that, in entertaining Hostility towards me, so as to endeavour to injure me, either in Character or Person, they were acting wrong, both as Persons calling themselves Christians and professing to act under the Board of Education.

[The last Question is repeated.]

I answer decidedly, I do think it an extraordinary Thing that any Man professing to be a Christian should entertain such an Hostility against another as the Roman Catholic Priests have manifested towards me and my People on account of my speaking against their Doctrines.

The Question is, whether you think it extraordinary that when you go to the Flock of a Priest, and represent his Doctrines to that Flock in the Way in which you feel it your Duty to represent them, that that Priest should feel some Hostility towards you?

I think it extraordinary that any one professing to be a Christian should entertain such Hostility, because our Lord has commanded us to bless those that curse us; I mean such Hostility as the Priest has manifested.

What is the Hostility that the Priest has manifested?

The Hostility is, first of all, endeavouring to injure us in our Property by establishing a System of exclusive Dealing; secondly, by commanding the People to hoot after us and to insult us as we travelled through the Island; and thirdly, making such Harangues to the People as are calculated to stir them up to inflict personal Injury upon us.

Who is the Priest who has done these Things?

The Reverend Martin Connolly, the present Parish Priest of Achill, and his Predecessor, whose Name, I think, was O'Maly.

Did Mr. Connolly endeavour to enforce upon his Flock the Practice of exclusive Dealing?

Yes, he did.

How do you know that?

I know it on the Affidavit of a Witness who was present in the Chapel in the Month of September when Dr. M'Hale visited the Island of Achill. A System of exclusive Dealing was then commanded to be observed towards us. On the same Occasion the Protestant Religion was described as having its Origin in Hell and its End in Hell, so that, as to hard speaking upon Doctrines, I think the Roman Catholic Priesthood have no Reason to complain.

You state this upon the Assurance of an Affidavit?

I do.

Where is that Affidavit?

I handed that Affidavit to his Lordship the Bishop of Exeter.

On what Occasion was it taken?

It was taken preparatory to my coming here.

With a view to make it Evidence here?

Yes.

At whose Desire?

It was my own Thought having it done.

You charge the Priest with having exhorted his People to abstain from dealing with your Congregation or your Mission?

From holding any dealing whatever with us, or from working as Labourers for us.

How do you know that?

I know it on the Testimony of another Person, whose Testimony I believe.

Rev E. Nangle.

Is that Person here?
He is.

You do not know it of your own Knowledge?
No. I know the Fact of Persons who had been in our Employment withdrawing from it immediately after I had received from that Individual his Testimony concerning the exclusive Dealing having been preached in the Chapel. I did not hear the Priest command that exclusive Dealing, but I saw the Effect of what I had been told he had done.

Did any one of those Men who withdrew from your Employment tell you that it was in consequence of being exhorted to do so by the Priest?
Many of them told me so.

Did you remonstrate with them upon that?
Yes, I often remonstrated with them.

From what Employment did they withdraw?
They were working as Labourers.

What Employment did they go to?
I cannot tell.

Did they get any other Employment?
I do not know.

The Witness who stated that Fact to you is here?
Yes.

You said that the Priest had commanded the People to hoot you; do you know that of your own Knowledge?
I mentioned to your Lordships Yesterday, that when the Inspector of the National Board of Education visited Achill I charged Mr. Connolly to his Face, in the Inspector's Presence, with having commanded the People to shout after me as I passed through the Island, and to insult me; and I called upon Mr. Connolly, in the Presence of the Inspector, to deny it if it were not true, and, as I stated Yesterday, Mr. Connolly's Answer was, "Sir, I am not going to answer your Question."

Is that the only Ground you have for stating that he commanded the People to hoot after you?
No, it is not the only Ground. Mr. Lewis, who was either the Inspector or Sub-Inspector of Police in the Town of Newport, the nearest Town of any Consideration to Achill, hearing of the Treatment we were receiving, he sent down to the Person commanding the Party of Police in Achill, ordering him to call upon Mr. Connolly, and to request him to exercise his Influence with his People to hinder them from shouting after us and insulting us; and the Answer that Mr. Connolly gave was this, "Tell the Person that sent you to me that it is by my Orders that they do so, and that no Method of Annoyance that we can practise against Mr. Nangle and his Flock, short of an actual Breach of the Law, shall be left untried and unpractised."

Were you present?
This was a Letter; it was a Report sent by the Person who had charge of the Party of Police in Cashel, a Village in Achill, where Mr. Connolly resides; it was an official Report written by a Serjeant of Police to his Superior.

What is the Name of the Person who wrote it?
I think the Man's Name was West, as well as I recollect.

Where did you see it?
In the Town of Newport.

Who showed it to you?
Mr. Lewis showed it me.

On what Occasion?
I was conversing with him; I cannot state from Recollection what was the Subject of our Conversation at the Time when he showed me this Letter.

409

Rev. E. Nangle.

What were the Words of it; have you got them in Writing?
No. I do not pledge myself that I use the very Terms used in the Letter, but I pledge myself that the Statement in the Letter is just as I have made it.

But you are not positive as to the Words?
Not as to the very Words; but I am quite positive as to the Meaning.

Another Thing that you stated was, that he made Harangues to the People; were you ever present at any of those Harangues?
No, I was not; but Witnesses are here who were.

Then you do not know of your own Knowledge what he said?
I merely state it on Testimony that I most assuredly believe.

Are the Population of the lower Class of the People of Achill very much attached to their Priests?
I cannot say that the Population of that Part of the Country are attached to the Priesthood; I should rather say the reverse, as far as my Experience extends. I hear universal Complaints amongst the People of the Avarice and Rapacity of the Priests in the Exaction of their Dues.

You think they were not attached to their Priests?
This is my Opinion. I answer, of course, in a general way. There are Individuals amongst them of course who are attached to the Priests; but as the Question is put in a general way I give a general Answer.

Do you suppose it to be entirely in Compliance with the Wishes of the Priests that they ill-treated you in this Way?
I do not see, from what I have brought before your Lordships, how I can come to any other Conclusion.

Had they ever shown any Disposition to ill-treat you before this Intervention on the part of the Priests?
No, they did not; on the contrary, I would mention that the first Night I landed in Achill the People of the Village had actually kindled a Bonfire to greet me on my Arrival amongst them.

Did they know at that Time your Object in coming amongst them?
I am firmly persuaded that they did, for this Reason; that we had a Steward employed in reclaiming Part of the Land for several Months previous to my Arrival in the Island, and that Steward had just the same Views on the Subject of the Roman Catholic Religion as I have.

That Steward was employed in reclaiming the Land?
He was.

Was he likewise employed in converting the People?
He took every Opportunity, as a Christian Man, of speaking to his Fellow Sinners.

Was that Person a Clergyman?
No, he was not.

Did he harangue the People?
He spoke to them whenever he had an Opportunity of doing so.

Did he hold the same Language towards them as you did?
His Views of the Roman Catholic Religion were just the same as mine, and therefore he adopted the same Course as I did.

Is he here?
No.

Do not you know whether he took the same Method of proclaiming his Opinion?
I suppose that he did.

But you do not know it?
No.

Rev. E. Nangle.

In point of fact had much Land been reclaimed before you went to Achill?

I cannot state how many Acres just now; some Acres were reclaimed.

Do you know how many People had been employed by that Person?

It varied according as the Season was fit for Work or otherwise.

How long had he been there before you came?

I could not exactly state, but I should say at least Six or Seven Months.

How many People were employed when you arrived?

I could not state that, because it varied considerably. I suppose probably the Average Number of Men employed was about Twenty-five or Twenty-six.

And had he converted any; had any become Protestants?

That Man was the Means of bringing some Persons out of the Church of Rome, who have since adhered steadfastly to the Profession of Protestantism.

Had they been converted to Protestantism before your Arrival?

No; but I believe the first Impressions were made on their Minds by Conversation with him.

You have stated that the People exhibited great Joy at your Arrival; do you conceive that that was in a great Measure to be attributed to the Hope that they entertained that by your Stay amongst them their temporal Condition would be improved?

Yes; I have no Hesitation in stating that it was.

And the Committee understand from the Course of your Evidence that their temporal Condition was, in your Opinion, in a State of Improvement?

I am sure that the People of Achill have reaped very considerable temporal Advantage from our Residence among them.

But their temporal Improvement has been exceedingly interfered with since these Feuds, to which you have now adverted, have been in progress, since the Minds of the People have been turned against you?

Yes, it has been considerably interfered with; but I trust we are surmounting the Difficulties.

Is there any Magistrate in the Island of Achill?

No.

You say they lighted a Bonfire, and that they expected great temporal Advantage from your coming there. When you first preached to them what you considered Christian Truth, and which opposed the Roman Catholic Belief, did you experience from the People any Hostility?

No, I did not.

Did you experience any Mark of their Readiness to hear you preach on that Subject?

Yes, I did.

Did they seem to have Pleasure in hearing the Word of God expounded by you in their own Language as from the Book of God?

Several of them did.

When was the first Occasion on which you experienced Hostility from the People?

I could not exactly state when it was.

Was it before or after you understood that the Priest had commanded them to be hostile?

I can state decidedly, that the Hostility of the People commenced after I had heard of their having been stirred up to Hostility by the Speeches of the Priest in the Chapel.

How many People could read in that Part of the Island?

There are not a great many Readers; I could not state the precise Number, but the Number of Readers is small.

What

What Means had they of judging, without reading, whether Mr. Nangle or the Priest was speaking the Word of Truth?

The only Means that they had was by the Exercise of that Judgment and Discrimination which God has given to every Man upon the Doctrines that they heard from us and the Doctrines that they heard from the Roman Catholic Priests. I conceive that the Testimony to the Truth was not insufficient to convince, because it was oral Testimony. The Judgment of Man may be exercised upon oral Testimony as well as upon written Testimony.

But were they of a Description of Persons that were likely to discriminate?

Yes; I think they are just as much disposed to do it and as qualified to do it as any other Persons in an uncultivated State.

Then, in fact, what they had to decide between was your Word and the Word of their own Priests?

Yes; both professed to be Teachers of the Truth, and it was for them to decide which was right and which was wrong.

Then could you be very much surprised at the Priest opposing the Doctrines that you taught?

I should not be surprised. If the Priest believed himself to be right, I think it would be his Duty to endeavour to persuade those under his Care that he was right and I wrong. I never complained of Argument and Persuasion being made use of; on the contrary I commend a Religious Teacher for doing it, if he supposes that the Doctrine he teaches is right. All I complain of is his interfering with our Civil Rights, and stirring up the People to Violence upon our Persons. I wish every Man to possess the same Liberty of Conscience and Liberty of Speech that I claim for myself as a Minister of Christ.

But the Object of your Exhortations was to lower the Priests in the Opinions of the Persons whom they taught?

I would say that the Object of our preaching was to exalt the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of Sinners; that was the Object of our preaching.

Then your Object was not to lower the Priests as such; that might be an incidental Consequence; but your main Object was to lead them to Christian Truth?

Decidedly.

In fact did not you preach and bring the most violently controverted Subjects before those who could not understand them?

I do not think that we brought any Subject before them that they were not, as intelligent Beings, capable of understanding. I do not wish to blink the Question. I openly avow that we did use controversial Preaching.

Is it your Opinion that the Peasantry of Ireland are, generally speaking, a very acute Race of Men?

I think, generally speaking, they are.

Is the Island of Achill an Exception to that?

I do not see why we should suppose that the Islanders of Achill are destitute of the Intelligence that belongs ordinarily to their Countrymen.

Did you always address them in the Irish Language?

Not on all Occasions; I did occasionally.

Is the Irish Language the common Language in use among them?

It is.

You were asked whether some of the Settlers had not quitted the Mission Land, and since returned to the Church of Rome, and you answered, "I do not know that they have." Do you mean by that Answer to state that none of your Settlers who have made a Profession of Protestantism have relapsed?

No, I did not intend to state that. Some Persons we detected to be Hypocrites, and we were obliged in consequence of that to put them away from

Rev. E. Nangle.

from our Land, so that their Abandonment of Protestantism was in fact previous to their leaving our Land, and not subsequent to it. As to others who have left our Land I have no Evidence of their having returned to the Church of Rome. I have the clearest and most decided Evidence that several of them have, even in the Face of very great Persecution, steadily maintained their Profession of Protestantism. I have heard of others having on some Occasions conformed to the Church of Rome, but those Persons have since declared, either to myself or to my Colleague Mr. Baylee, that they did so, not that they believed the Doctrines of Romanism, but to shelter themselves from Persecution.

What was the Number of those Persons that you referred to as being relapsed?

The Number of Persons that we put away from our Land on the Persuasion that they were acting the Hypocrite was Five.

Did you conceive that such a Proceeding of having put away those Persons would expose you to any Persecution or any violent Language?

I did think that it might expose me to a Charge of Persecution, but unjustly, because those Persons came to our Place on the Understanding that they were Protestants, and I therefore considered that when I found them out to be acting the Hypocrite, I was quite justifiable in excluding them. If I were to feign myself a Roman Catholic and to go into a Monastery, my Expulsion, on being found to be a Hypocrite, would furnish no just Ground for a Charge of Persecution against the Members of such an Establishment. The Cases seem to be analogous.

Have you in any public Documents set abroad that these People were Hypocrites?

Yes; it is my invariable Desire to set forth all that is discouraging as well as encouraging in the Work of our Mission; and in the last Report of our Missionary Proceedings, published in this Month, there is the following Statement, in Page 18: "A very few we have detected in gross Hypocrisy, maintaining an unabated Affection for the Abominations of Popery, while they professedly joined themselves to us in the Hope of temporal Advantage."

You published a Report addressed to the Society that sent you there?

Yes; the Report is written by myself.

Do you conceive that such Facts as these you mention with respect to the Removal of these Individuals have brought any Discredit upon your Mission?

I think they are calculated to bring no more Discredit upon our Mission than the Apostacy of Judas, or the Hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira, was calculated to bring Discredit on the Christian Religion and the primitive Church. Such Things must be expected.

You stated that some Members of the Settlement had left your Land; have any of those Persons relapsed?

I have heard of several of them having maintained their Protestant or Christian Profession steadfastly. With respect to others, I have heard of their conforming on some Occasions to the Church of Rome, but they have since that declared, some of them to me and some of them to Mr. Baylee, that their Conformity was only to screen them from Persecution, and that they did not believe the Doctrines of the Church of Rome; and therefore I conceive that I am fully justified in stating as I did, that I could not say that those Persons who have departed from our Land had relapsed into what I believe to be the Errors of the Church of Rome.

You have spoken To-day of the Subject of the Unregeneracy of the Members of the Church of Rome; do you mean to apply that merely to the Members of the Church of Rome, or to the Members of any other Church?

By no means. I include every Son and Daughter of Adam on the Face of the Earth who is not under the Influence of the Spirit of Christ, whether they be Protestants or Romanists, or Heathen or Mahomedan.

Rev. E. Nangle.

You conceive that it is the Duty of a Protestant Minister to preach the Gospel to all Persons whomsoever he may be brought in contact with, whatever their Profession may be?
Most certainly.

Had you any Object in the Line that you took at Achill to bring Persons over to the Established Church, in order to swell the Numbers of that Church; or was your Object to bring them from what you conceive to be Error to Truth?
My Object has always been to endeavour to bring them from Error to Truth, as the Scripture speaks, "from Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God."

Then your Object was not to swell the Number of the Protestant Established Church of Ireland?
No. I should think that a very poor Object indeed to spend one's Time and Strength for.

Where is the nearest Magisterial Bench to the Island of Achill?
The Town of Newport is the nearest Petty Sessions.

How far is that?
Twenty-five Miles from the Place where I reside.

Previous to your Arrival who was the Person in the Island of Achill that had most Influence over the People?
I cannot state what the State of Things was before my Arrival.

There is no resident Proprietor, is there?
No. I should suppose that the Priest was the most influential Person in the Island.

Does not a Mr. M'Laughlin live in the Island?
No. He owns Part of the Island; but he lives upon the main Land.

Is he much there?
He is not a great deal in the Island.

You found these People very far remote from any Magisterial Authority, and not having the Benefit of the Residence of any Clergyman of the Established Church, or of any large Proprietors, chiefly under the Influence of the Priests, living very quietly and contentedly, and in no particular Degree of Vice or Sin otherwise than as connected with their Ignorance of what you term the Way of Truth?
As I have before stated, they were not pre-eminent for Vice above the rest of the Population of Ireland.

You have stated that they were in a tranquil Condition?
They were.

And you have stated also that at that Time the Priest was the most influential Person in the Island?
Yes.

And since that, you think the Priest stirred them up to Evil against you?
I not only think that, but I am certain of it.

Then must they not have had a good deal of Affection for this Priest?
That does not necessarily follow. I believe that they had not Affection for the Priest. There is another Influence that can tell on the Mind of Human Beings besides Affection; the Terrors of Superstition exercise a most powerful Influence, and I believe it was by means of that the Roman Catholic Priesthood maintained their Authority over the Achill Peasantry. With your Lordships Permission I will relate an Anecdote illustrative of this. There is a Man resident in the Village of Keel in the Island of Achill; that Man was heard to say, "I never gave but One Shout after Mr. Nangle, and I only gave that Shout in order that I might not have the Priest's Curse lying upon me, for he prayed in the Chapel that the Tongue might drop out of any one that did not shout; and as soon as I got the Priest's Curse removed from me by giving

Rev. E. Nangle.

that One Shout I shouted no more." I state this on the Testimony of a Witness of whose Veracity I have no Doubt whatever; and if your Lordships doubt the Truth of it you can summon the Witness, and have it from him personally.

He is not here?
He is not.

You do not know it of your own Knowledge?
I do not; but I have the same Certainty of its Truth as your Lordships would derive from the Testimony of an immediate Witness.

You had not it from the Individual himself?
I had it from the Individual to whom that Speech was made; by the Person to whom I have alluded.

Who is that?
His Name is James Meredith.

What is he?
He is employed by me as a Scripture Reader.

Who told it to Meredith?
The Individual himself. I can state the Name that he goes by, Michael Crone; I do not know that this is his proper Name; to distinguish different Individuals of the same Family or Clan they have very frequently Bye Names. I rather fancy that this is a Bye Name; but the Individual to whom I allude is well known in the Island under the Name of Michael Crone.

Do you know upon what Occasion he related this to the Scripture Reader; was he applying to him for any thing?
It was merely accidental. It was incidentally in the course of Conversation that I heard our Reader relate this Anecdote.

And it is your firm Belief that the Man shouted after you because he was afraid that if he did not his Tongue would drop out of his Mouth?
I have it on the Assertion of the Man himself, and I do believe that many of the Irish Peasantry are under such a superstitious Influence as would lead them in such Circumstances to form such a Supposition.

Do you believe that the Man himself thought the Tongue would drop out of his Mouth?
I have no Reason to disbelieve his own Words; it was his own Statement.

What was the Priest's Curse?
The Priest's Curse was that the Tongue might drop out of any one that did not shout, and in order to put this Curse away from himself Michael Crone did give a Shout.

Did you ever know an Instance of any similar Case?
I cannot just now recall them to my Recollection, but if I were to sit down and think over the Things that have come under my own Observation, I could compile a Chapter of such Anecdotes.

You stated that when you arrived in the Island you found it perfectly tranquil; did that Tranquillity continue undisturbed for some Time after your Arrival?
It continued undisturbed for a considerable Time after my Arrival.

How long?
I really cannot exactly state, but it was, as well as my Recollection serves me, for Two or Three Months.

Was the Interruption of that Tranquillity coeval with the Arrival of Dr. M'Hale in the Island, and the Commencement, on the Part of the Priest, of the Conduct to which you have adverted?
It was not coeval with the Entrance of Dr. M'Hale, because the Denunciations in the Chapel had commenced before that, and even before Mr. Connolly, the present Priest, came.

Did

Rev. E. Nangle.

Did Dr. M'Hale come in the course of his ordinary Visitation of the Island?

I cannot say what Dr. M'Hale's Arrangements might be. I could not take upon myself to answer that Question.

With reference to your Letter to Mr. Carlile, No. 1, why did you consider that the Introduction of National Schools, or the Application of the National Funds to the Priest's School, would necessarily check your Exertions?

Because it appears to me that the Absence of any School but ours gave the Children who were desirous to come to it a very good Pretext for doing so; but when the Priest established another School, then it became an Act of more daring Rebellion against his Authority to pass by that School and to come to ours.

You were understood to say, that the Priest had established Schools; indeed in your Letter you refer to the Schools established?

Yes; but I stated that those Schools would have their Existence perpetuated by a Grant from the National Board.

Had you Reason to suppose that if the National Board did not give a Grant of Money, those Schools would not continue?

It was the Impression upon my Mind that they would not.

Had their Numbers decreased?

My Reason for supposing that the Opposition Schools would not continue, unless supported by the National Board, arose out of the Persuasion of my Mind, that the Roman Catholic Priests had not sufficient Zeal in the Cause of Education to induce them to supply Funds for the Support of the Schools from their own Pockets, and that therefore, if the Funds were not supplied by the National Board, the Schools would fall to the Ground.

Have you any Ground for that Opinion, except a speculative Notion that the Roman Catholic Priests could not have sufficient Zeal for Education?

It appears to me that their Conduct has manifested such a Want of Zeal in the Cause of Education as justifies that Opinion. In fact, in Achill itself, I had a most striking Instance of the Indifference of the Roman Catholic Priesthood on the Subject of Education, because there was no School when I first went there but a small Pay School in a distant Part of the Island, Six or Seven Miles from our Settlement.

Had the Clergyman of the Established Church given any thing to any School?

Not that I know of.

The Committee understand from your Statement that Dr. M'Hale came into the Island after the Appointment of Mr. Connolly?

He did.

Had you any Reason to know that Dr. M'Hale as well as Mr. Connolly used inflammatory Language to the People with respect to your Settlement?

I know this, that when very inflammatory Language had been used by Two Priests in Dr. M'Hale's Presence in the Chapel, he stood up and signified his Approval of all that the Priests had spoken.

How do you know that?

I know it on the Testimony of a Witness who is now in London.

Was it a Matter of Notoriety in the Island that Dr. M'Hale had in the Manner in which you have described encouraged the inflammatory Language of the Priests?

Yes, it was universally known through the Island. A Speech delivered by the Roman Catholic Archbishop in the Chapel, of course, must have become the Subject of common Notoriety amongst the People.

Did the Feeling of Excitement appear to you to be stronger after the Visit of Dr. M'Hale than it was before his Arrival?

Yes, unquestionably; I had the plainest Evidence of it in the Withdrawal of Labourers from our Land who were working previously contentedly and thankfully.

Rev. E. Nangle.

You stated Yesterday that the Schoolmaster O'Donnell had admitted that he had gone in the Manner described by you to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Arrival in the Island?

Yes, it was admitted by O'Donnell to the Inspector. The Acknowledgment of this Admission will be found in No. 23. of the printed Returns.

It appears in the Inspector's Report, No. 23., that O'Donnell admits that upon the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island, met him with Green Boughs, &c., &c. Does that contain an Admission of the whole Charge made by you?

When Mr. Kelly, the Inspector, came to Achill, and told me that he was sent by the Board to investigate certain Charges that had been brought by me against O'Donnell, he called upon me to prove those Charges. I went for a Copy of the very Letter I had written to the Board, as it is here in the printed Returns, No. 3.: "I beg leave to inform you that James O'Donnell, Master of the Dugort National School in this Island, headed a Procession, carrying Flags and Banners, which went to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Arrival in this Place. O'Donnell bore a Flag with the Inscription, 'Welcome Religion and Liberty,' which was sufficiently intelligible to all who knew that Dr. M'Hale is a Bishop of the Church of Rome and the Advocate of Repeal." I read this Letter in the hearing of the Inspector. In fact, my Charge was stated in the very Words contained in this Letter, and it was to the Charge as stated in those Words that Mr. Kelly said O'Donnell pleaded guilty. Then, on turning to the Inspector's Report, your Lordships will see what appears to me to be an Attempt to mitigate and soften down the whole Business. "O'Donnell admits that upon the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island, went to meet him." I represented him as being the Ringleader in the whole Business, as heading the Procession, and as carrying a Banner with, to say the least of it, a very objectionable Inscription upon it; and all these important Facts are merged, and O'Donnell is just represented as a Person who, in common with the rest of the Inhabitants of the Island, took a Part in this Procession.

What do you understand by "&c. &c."?

I really do not understand what Signification to attach to it; I think that an official Document should not be worded in such a very vague and ambiguous Manner.

Should you have thought it very extraordinary that O'Donnell should have gone with Green Boughs to meet his own Bishop on his Arrival in the Island, if such was the Practice of the Country, if he had merely gone with Green Boughs?

If he had merely gone with Green Boughs, if such had been the Practice of the Country, I should not have thought it strange.

But what you complained of was his going with Banners and obnoxious Inscriptions?

It was.

And you do not think that in this respect the Inspector's Report contains an Account of O'Donnell's Admission of your Charge?

I think it does not.

You spoke of Scripture Readers; what do you mean by "Scripture Readers"?

A Scripture Reader is a Man generally selected from the humbler Walks of Life, who has an enlarged Knowledge of his Bible, and who also exemplifies the Power and Excellence of the Truths contained in the Bible in his Life and Conversation. Such Persons are chosen as very fit Instruments to go about reading the Holy Scriptures amongst those Persons who are not able to read for themselves, and amongst others who are willing to hear them, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants; and as they read the Holy Scriptures they converse on the Subject of their Doctrines and Precepts.

Who chooses them in your Missionary Settlement?

They were chosen by myself.

Were

Rev. E. Nangle.

Were they Inhabitants of Achill?
None of those who are employed as Scripture Readers are Natives of Achill. Two of them have come from the County of Sligo, and Two more are young Men from the Neighbourhood of Westport: there are Four in all in our Employment.

You say they were in a humble Class of Life; were they common Peasants?
They were not in the lowest Grade of Society, but small Farmers.

What Emolument do they receive?
Our Scripture Readers receive 24*l.* a Year, and if they choose to cultivate it they have an English Acre of reclaimed Mountain, and a House to live in.

It is their Business to go about into the Cabins and read the Scriptures?
To all who are willing to hear them.

Do they ever force themselves into the Cabins where they are not willing to receive them?
No, they never do; if the Inmates of the Cabins desire them to go out they go out immediately.

Those are the Directions you give them?
Certainly.

Do they ever enter into Discussions and Controversies?
They do.

In the Cabins and elsewhere?
Yes.

They are instructed so to do?
Yes, certainly.

You are speaking of the Scripture Readers under your Society?
Yes; I am confining my Observations to the Scripture Readers connected with our Society.

Have you any Knowledge of the Scripture Readers of other Missions?
I have had Knowledge of other Scripture Readers through the Country, connected with the Scripture Readers Society for Ireland.

Is there any Agent who in the Absence of Sir Richard O'Donnell, the Proprietor of the Island, took any Interest in the Concerns of the People?
Mr. Alexander Clendinning of Westport is Sir R. O'Donnell's Agent.

Does he frequently come to the Island?
He has never been in the Island since I came to it.

Has there been no Person on the Part of the Land Owner to receive the Rents from the People?
Yes, there is an under Agent, a Person of the Name of Gillespie; he comes down occasionally to receive the Rents.

Did you ever state to him the Manner in which you were ill-used in that Island?
I dare say I have, but I cannot state positively that I have; I only saw Mr. Gillespie once or twice since I went to the Island.

Is there any County Cess collected in the Island?
I believe there is, but I cannot state positively.

Is there any Tithe collected?
I have heard it stated that Mr. Wilson does receive 100*l.* a Year out of the Island of Achill; but I do not state this positively, as of my own Knowledge.

You referred to a Report of your Society; is that Report published annually or monthly?
It is published annually.

Rev. E. Nangle.

Does it circulate in the Island of Achill?
No; this Report is published for the Information of Persons who are Subscribers.

Have you ever published any Works or Writings in the Island of Achill?
Yes, I have.

Large Works or small Works?
We have a printing Press, and we have printed Pamphlets of 150 or 160 Pages; and we have also printed small Tracts and Hand-bills.

Controversial Tracts?
Many of them controversial.

Have you any of them here?
No.

Could you procure them in London?
I could procure them in the course of some Days by writing for them.

Are they in English or Irish?
I printed One Tract, Fourteen Questions addressed to the Priest, in consequence of some Observations of his in the Chapel; and it is in both English and Irish, on opposite Pages. I would also beg leave, in connexion with my Books and Tracts, to lay before your Lordships some Tracts and Writings of the Roman Catholic Priesthood and of Dr. M'Hale in reference to the Achill Mission, in order that your Lordships may not have an ex-parte View of the Subject, but may see the Publications on both Sides. The Documents to which I refer have been printed with Dr. M'Hale's Name affixed to them in the public Newspapers.

They are not Pamphlets published by Dr. M'Hale, but Letters in the Newspaper collected and published?
Letters referring to the Achill Mission.

They were in the Provincial Papers, were they not?
They were in the Provincial Papers, and also in the Dublin Papers.

You have stated that in your Opinion the Population of Ireland, including the Island of Achill, is naturally acute and able to distinguish between Truth and Falsehood; are you of opinion that that natural Acuteness would be more likely to enable them to distinguish between Truth and Falsehood after having received the Benefit of teaching, and having acquired the Practice of reading, than in their natural and uninformed State?
Of course that natural Acuteness would be sharpened by Cultivation and Exercise.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Lieut. J. Irwin.

Lieutenant JOSEPH IRWIN, R. N., is called in, and examined as follows:

Had you at any Time in the Month of October 1831 the Command of the Coast-guard District of Westport?
Yes.

At that Time did you know a Person named Timothy M'Carthy?
Yes.

Was he then a Boatman serving upon that Station?
He was.

Under whom as Chief Boatman was he serving?
John Rutledge.

At what Station?
At a detached Station which I put on myself, called Rossmore Point, near Newport.

Did

Lieut. J. Irwin.

Did John Rutledge make any Reports to you at any Time respecting the Conduct of the Persons under him?

He had Occasion frequently to make Reports of that Kind.

Respecting James O'Donnell?

Yes.

What Report did he make to you?

M'Carthy first reported the Circumstance to me respecting James O'Donnell.

What was that?

M'Carthy came into Westport, where I resided, by Order of Rutledge, who was his Chief Boatman, to report the Conduct of James O'Donnell for making use of improper Language at the Station, disaffected Language, as he called it; and when M'Carthy came to me to make the Report I told him I would take the first Opportunity of inquiring into it.

Is M'Carthy here?

He is.

Was this a Report made to you officially?

It was.

What was the Nature of the Report thus made officially to you by M'Carthy?

That this James O'Donnell, an extra Boatman, had made use of seditious Language at the Station. He mentioned the Language that he made use of; I do not exactly recollect the Terms.

Do you recollect the Effect of it?

The Effect of it was that the Protestant Church would soon be put down; that the Country would soon be their own; that O'Connell would be their King, and all that Sort of Language.

Is M'Carthy a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?

M'Carthy is a Roman Catholic.

Then when he said "their own," did you understand M'Carthy as meaning that O'Donnell had said to him that the Country would soon be the Country of M'Carthy and his own and his Fellow Roman Catholics?

Yes, I understood it so.

What did you do in consequence of this?

It was my Intention to inquire into it the first Opportunity; and the first Opportunity I had was the Boat coming in from Rossmore Point. Immediately, on hearing of the Boat coming in, I sent for Rutledge and M'Carthy, who were the principal Persons who had heard the Conversation, and I asked Rutledge if he heard O'Donnell make use of this Sort of Language at the Station, and he said he had repeatedly heard him, and that he had warned him to be more cautious, and told him that if he did not desist he would report the Circumstance to me. M'Carthy at the same Time said that O'Donnell still persisted in this Sort of Thing, and in his Presence had made use of similar Language; and M'Carthy went to his Chief Boatman, and reported O'Donnell's Conduct upon the Occasion. He said, "You had better go to the Inspecting Commander, and acquaint him;" upon which he came to me.

Had Rutledge then told you, of his own Knowledge, officially, the seditious Language used in the Presence of Rutledge by O'Donnell?

Rutledge said, that he had repeatedly heard him make use of the same Language, and when I asked him to repeat that Language, it was much the same Sort of Words as I have already stated. I looked upon it as rather an idle Thing than otherwise. They are all Roman Catholics at that Station but Rutledge, and I thought it might have been common Conversation among themselves—idle Conversation; but I said I would make further Inquiry to satisfy myself, for I was interested about the Man; he was recommended to me by Sir Richard O'Donnell of Newport, and I was rather interested about him, and I did not wish to listen to it unless I was satisfied that there was more in it than a mere Report. I made that Inquiry at Ross-

Lieut. J. Irwin.

more Point. At that Time there was a great deal of the Steel-boy System going on; it is similar to what is called the Whitefeet in other Parts of the Country, or Ribbonism; and I was afraid that this O'Donnell might have been a sworn Steel-boy, and from his Language I feared that he was deeply concerned with them, and I thought he was not a fit Person to trust in that Situation; as he was a Man I employed myself I was solely responsible for his Conduct, and therefore I thought he was an improper Person to continue in the Coast-guard, and I ordered Rutledge to discharge him off the Books.

Did O'Donnell afterwards apply to you at any Time for an Investigation?

It is a very long Time ago, for it occurred in October 1831; and the Impression upon my Mind is, that riding along the Road (but it is more like a Dream to me than any thing else) I met O'Donnell,—this was after he was discharged,—and he asked me my Reasons for discharging him; and he said, "I have been discharged, and I understand there has been some Report made against me." I said there had. I have not a very perfect Recollection of the Conversation; but this is the Impression upon my Mind. I said that his Chief Boatman and one of the Boatmen had been making Complaints against him, and that he was insolent also to M'Carthy. When M'Carthy remonstrated with him for the Language he had been making use of, and told him if he did not desist he would inform his Commander, upon this O'Donnell was insolent to him. That was one of the Charges that M'Carthy brought against him, and which I think I told him. He requested me to make an Inquiry into it, and I told him I would, and that I should satisfy myself. I said, "I have already made Inquiry, and I think there is sufficient Proof that you have misbehaved yourself." I do not I think I told him that I had discharged him for any particular Conduct at the Time; I am not sure whether I did or not; but I made Inquiry again upon O'Donnell's mentioning this. The first Time I went to the Station I determined to satisfy myself that he had been guilty of this Conduct, and I inquired again into it. When I got to the Station I sent for Rutledge and M'Carthy again and inquired of them the Manner in which he had done it, wishing to know the exact Manner in which he had made use of this Language, and the Periods, and the Persons present, and so forth; and I was in hopes that O'Donnell would have been there at the Time; but he was not there; he lived at some Distance, and I had no Chance of getting hold of him; and I was so perfectly satisfied that I was justified in discharging him that I did not interfere further in it. I told Rutledge, "He is discharged; I am satisfied that he is an improper Person." I mentioned this to Sir Richard O'Donnell; I told him, Sir Richard, "I am afraid this Man whom you recommended to me is one of the Steel-boys of the Country;" for his Conduct at that Time seemed to have justified the Suspicion; and I said, "I have discharged him." Sir Richard was very indignant indeed at this Man's Conduct, and said, "You are perfectly right; I am quite satisfied."

Did you tell O'Donnell that Rutledge and M'Carthy were the Causes of his being discharged?

I think it is most likely that I told him that the Complaint against him was by Rutledge and M'Carthy.

Is Rutledge now in a feeble State of Health?

He is in a very feeble State of Health.

He received a Wound at one Time, did not he?

He did at one Time under me. He has been under me ever since 1822, at different Periods, for a long Time, in the Westport District, and he was so good a Man that I always gave him in charge of the Station. I thought he conducted it much better than any other Officer in the District.

You have entire Confidence in what Rutledge said?

Perfect Confidence, because he is a Man that does not meddle with anybody.

Have you seen him recently?

I have.

Is

Lieut. J. Irwin.

Is his State of Memory or his State of Mind on any account such as to make you receive with Hesitation any Statement that he might make to you now?

It is; his Memory is very much impaired. He received at one Time, when he was with me in Achill, — I was in the Village at the Time, — a very severe Blow on the Head from a Stone, and I did not think he would live; I thought his Skull was fractured. We had not Medical Aid for him at the Time, and the Man has never been well since.

How long ago was this?
This was several Years ago.

Was it in October 1831 that you discharged O'Donnell?
To the best of my Recollection it was. I returned to Westport in 1830.

You paid particular Attention to this O'Donnell in consequence of his being recommended to you by Sir Richard O'Donnell?
I was anxious that he should continue in the Service, for I had understood from the Miss O'Donnells, who were also interested in the Man, that he was a Foster Brother of Sir Richard's.

You were particularly anxious to keep him in the Corps, if you found it consistent with your Duty to do so?
I was, because Sir Richard O'Donnell was a Person I had great Respect for, and he recommended him strongly.

Some Time afterwards you mentioned his Discharge to Sir Richard?
I did.

Although those Circumstances were likely to bring the Fact of your having discharged him to your Mind, it appears that in July 1836 last Year you had no Recollection of having discharged any such Person; how do you account for that?
I received a Letter from the Secretary of the Board of Education, which merely mentioned the Circumstance of a Person of the Name of O'Donnell being under me, and asked me the Cause of Dismissal of James O'Donnell of Rossmore in 1832. He did not mention the Station where the Man was, or the Officer he was serving under. There were several Persons of the Name of O'Donnell serving under me, one of whom my Mind was fixed upon immediately I received the Letter, who I knew might have been discharged from a permanent Man having been appointed, and it struck me that that was the Person he alluded to. Now I know that this had not been the Case with the O'Donnell I had then on my Mind. The Place which Mr. Kelly mentioned was Rossmore. There are a great Number of Ross's, and various Names of that Kind, at all of which we had Stations at different Periods, and as he did not name the Station, which is Rossmore Point near Newport, I did not recollect the Circumstance.

On the 30th of July you did not recollect the Circumstance of having discharged this James O'Donnell?
I did not.

What brought it to your Recollection upon the 14th of August?
Mr. Dombrain, an Inspector-general of the Coast-guard, the Head of our Department in Ireland, sent me a Note from Mr. Nangle, wishing to know if James O'Donnell had been discharged by Lieutenant Irwin from the Coast-guard, mentioning the Station where he was, at Rossmore Point, under John Rutledge, Chief Boatman. The Moment I saw that Note the whole Thing occurred to me at once. There was nothing more in the Note than just that; (I did not know Mr. Nangle;) but that brought it to my Recollection.

You never told O'Donnell that it was for seditious Language that you discharged him?
I do not think I did.

Was it for seditious Language that you discharged him?
It was.

Lieut. J. Irwin.

If this was the Reason why you discharged him, how happened it that you did not inform him so?

I thought he was a Steel-boy, and I was afraid of leaving Rutledge (who had suffered very much before in the Country) and M'Carthy in the Power of his Associates in that Neighbourhood. It was a very remote Part of the Country, and I thought it unnecessary to tell O'Donnell that.

Were Rutledge and M'Carthy alone at that Station?

No; there were Five there at that Time, to the best of my Recollection.

You were afraid to leave them there in the Power of these Steel-boys; you thought their Animosity would be excited if you told O'Donnell that you discharged him for that Reason?

Yes; I thought it was unnecessary to tell O'Donnell.

Do you know that that James O'Donnell is the O'Donnell that is now a Schoolmaster?

I do not know.

Have you ever heard that the Coast-guard Stations have been with their few Men there in considerable Danger from illegally-associated Persons, or Persons otherwise disaffected?

They were never under any Danger under me, but Individuals have been in Danger who have made themselves obnoxious to the People; and I considered that if it were known that those Two Men had preferred such a Complaint against one of their Leaders, it would naturally make them obnoxious to the Party. And not only that, but the Men were threatened that they would be waylaid and beaten.

When did you leave that Station?

I left the District in 1827; I returned to it in 1830, and in 1835 I left it again.

Do not you believe that any Individual who was supposed to have given such Information which had led to the Man's Dismissal would have been in Danger?

I believe he would; I was satisfied in my own Mind of the Propriety of dismissing him. I was responsible for that Man, because I had employed him myself; he had no Appointment from the Government; it was my own doing, and under such Circumstances I was solely responsible. They were at that Time swearing Steel-boys; continually swearing Men against their Inclination. I know several Persons who even hid themselves to get rid of it, that were compelled to be sworn; and with respect to this Man O'Donnell I knew his Associates to be bad Men; one of them was a Man of the Name of Kelly, who has since been transported for that Sort of Offence, so that altogether I felt myself responsible for O'Donnell's Conduct.

Did you give him any Reason for his Discharge?

I did give him some Reason, I think. I said, you have committed yourself, or something to that Effect; and you have been charged with Insolence to M'Carthy your superior Boatman.

There were Two Charges against him?

There were Two Charges; one was consequent upon the other. M'Carthy is a Catholic himself, and he said, if you do not desist from making use of this Sort of Language I must acquaint the Inspecting Commander; he then was insolent to M'Carthy, which made a Second Charge, and was consequent upon the other.

What was the Occupation that this O'Donnell had?

An extra Boatman. Whenever a Man is sick, or a Man is removed or leaves, I have it in my Power to fill up that Vacancy by any Fisherman or effective Person upon the Coast till the Person is well, or the Person that is on Leave returns, or if he is removed till his Vacancy is filled up by the Government.

And he did not receive Pay from Government except when he was so employed?

No.

Did

Lieut. J. Irwin.

Did he believe while he was serving with you that he was only in a temporary Situation?

That he perfectly understood, and that his Situation depended upon his Efficiency and good Conduct.

Did he not know that, let his Conduct be what it might, he would have been dismissed when the Occasion ceased for which he received the Appointment?

Yes.

So that if he had been as well conducted as he was ill conducted you would still have felt it necessary to dismiss him when the Situation was filled up?

Yes; but I had always the Power to put him into a Situation if he was a good Man.

Did M'Carthy and Rutledge express any Wish that their Names should not be mentioned as making a Complaint against him?

M'Carthy did not; Rutledge was in some degree reluctant, because he had overlooked the Thing before, and he had threatened the Man thus: "If you make use of this Sort of Language I must report you." Rutledge had been a very great Sufferer; he was struck by a Person, and no Person to this Day can tell who struck him, or the Reason for it; he was a harmless inoffensive Man, and he was a little nervous and frightened afterwards.

If it had not been for this Circumstance, and if there had been no Apprehension either upon your Mind or upon theirs, should you not have thought it more consistent with Justice towards O'Donnell to have brought him Face to Face with his Accusers; to have heard their Case and to have heard his Defence?

It was my Intention when I went to the Station to make a Second Inquiry into it. I expected that O'Donnell would have been there, because I told him I would go there the first Opportunity; and it was my Intention to have made Inquiry in the Presence of O'Donnell, but he was not there; he lived among his Friends, and I did not know where to find him, and I did not think it necessary. I would have done it for his own Satisfaction had he been there; but my Mind was perfectly made up to discharge him.

At the Time that you actually discharged him did not he express some Desire to know the Cause for which he was discharged?

He did. When I met him on the Road some Time after his Discharge I told him he had behaved improperly at the Station; I think I said "You have behaved yourself improperly; you were insolent to your superior Boatman." I thought that alone was sufficient for me to communicate to him as the Cause of his Discharge.

Would you have dismissed him in that Way, without any Investigation, if he had been a regular Boatman appointed by the Government?

I could not. I must have preferred Charges against him.

Was the Charge substantiated upon Oath?

No; and it was not necessary.

Had you the Power of administering an Oath to the Person who gave this Information?

No.

But in the Investigation of a Charge against a regular Boatman you would have to go through some Form?

The Board of Customs give me a Commission for the Purpose to enable me to swear the Men.

But in Cases of extra Boatmen they are under your absolute Command?

Perfectly so. I had another strong Reason for believing this Man had been guilty of this Offence: M'Carthy being a Catholic, I thought that unless they had had some private Quarrel or some Pique he would not have made this Charge against him; and I particularly inquired if there had been any Quarrel between the Men, for I was most anxious to keep the Man.

Lieut. J. Irwin.

Did you find there had been any Quarrel?
No; I could not make out that there had been any Quarrel; and I thought that M'Carthy was afraid of allowing the Thing to go any further.

When you spoke to Sir Richard O'Donnell, he did not say any thing disadvantageous to O'Donnell's Character?
No; he said, "I did not expect that of him;" and he was very much annoyed at his having turned out so.

He did not say that he of his own Knowledge knew any Harm of him; but he was simply alluding to the Reasons you had told him for dismissing him?
He was alluding entirely to what I told him; not only that, but if O'Donnell had conceived himself improperly treated by me, he would naturally have gone to Sir Richard.

Was O'Donnell, generally speaking, a well-behaved Man?
I see so little of the Men as Inspecting Commander that I cannot say; but Rutledge, I think, did not make any other Complaint against him.

How long had he been serving with you?
Some Months, I think.

You never heard any Complaint against him for improper Conduct in any other respect?
No; I think he was a sober Man. I scarcely recollect the Man, and I do not think I should know him if I saw him.

Did you ever hear that he was in any way concerned in Steel-boy Outrages?
No; I do not think I ever heard much of the Man afterwards; his Associates, I heard, were bad Men.

Did you ever hear what became of him afterwards?
I never heard a Word about the Man till Mr. Kelly wrote to me to know if such a Person had served under me. If Mr. Kelly had mentioned the Station that he was at, and the Officer under whom he had served, I should have recollected the Circumstance at once.

Do you feel now perfectly sure that the Person concerning whom Mr. Kelly wrote to you is this same O'Donnell?
No; I have never seen the Man since; I am speaking of a Person of the Name of James O'Donnell, who was serving under me at the Time; I know noth ng of him afterwards.

You have said that the first Time that James O'Donnell's Name was brought to your Attention was in a Letter from Mr. Kelly, the Secretary of the Board, on the 25th July 1836; and you were understood to say that Mr. Kelly mentioned the Cause of Dismissal in his Letter: were you rightly understood in that?
Yes, he mentioned the Cause.

Will you read No. 20. of the printed Correspondence before the Committee?
"Sir. At the Request of the Commissioners of Education I beg leave to inquire from you the Cause of the Dismissal of James O'Donnell, extra Boatman at the Station of Rossmore in 1832, from the Service. They are anxious to be informed upon this Point, as this Man is now a Teacher in one of the National Schools, and they feel assured that they can have this Information in a satisfactory Manner from you only, as being the Officer under whom he served."

Does he there mention the Cause of Dismissal?
No, he does not.

Then there was the less Reason for your Recollection being drawn to this Case at that Time?
Certainly; and, in fact, my Mind was fixed upon a James O'Donnell that was serving under me at the Station of Ross. There were several Rosses; Rossmore and Islandmore, and several Places similarly named.

You have stated that Rutledge received a bad Wound; had Rutledge received that Wound before the Dismissal of O'Donnell or afterwards?
Before.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

TIMOTHY M'CARTHY is called in, and examined as follows: *Timothy M'Carthy*

Were you at any Time a Coast-guard Man at Rossmore Point, under Lieutenant Irwin?
I was.

Did you know a Coast-guard Man named James O'Donnell at that Time?
I did.

Had you ever Occasion to report the Conduct of James O'Donnell?
I had.

To whom did you report it?
To the Chief Boatman under Mr. Irwin.

Who was that?
John Rutledge.

What did you report of him?
Rebellious Speeches, and saying that the Tithes should be done away with, that no Tithes should be paid, and that Ireland should be free and flourish once more; and himself and a Man of the Name of David Kelly made a great Noise. He came out of his House into mine; there was only a thin Wall between his House and mine, and we had One Roof for both Houses. I told him it was a great Shame of him to make the Noise he was making, to make the Speech as he was making; and he told me he would have no Thanks to me, and called me an Informer. At the Time he called me an Informer I went out to the Chief Boatman and reported him. He was standing on the Road, and told me to go in to Mr. Irwin and report it.

Did he tell you any thing about the Name of O'Connell?
I hardly remember what he said now, it is so long ago, it is more than Five Years; I know he said a good deal more than I recollect now.

To what Effect was it?
Whenever one of them would make a Speech, it was in regard of O'Connell, and they would have loud cheering. They used to be at it as if Two Gentlemen were against each other. He mentioned that Ireland would be free, and that it would flourish once more.

Have you any Knowledge of any of his Companions?
David Kelly used to visit at his House very often.

What was there particular in David Kelly?
He used to make Speeches the same as O'Donnell would.

Was David Kelly ever brought to Justice for any thing?
I have not heard of him since I left that Place, but he was not at that Time.

You never heard of his being transported?
Not till George Creasy told me of it.

Who was David Kelly?
A Brother of the Priest who was there.

Where was he Priest?
He was in the County of Mayo.

Was he a Householder or a Farmer?
He was a Farmer.

Whose Tenant was he?
I am not sure, unless he was Sir Richard O'Donnell's Tenant.

You said these Men were making a Noise. When they were making a Noise were they at all drunk?
No, I did not notice them to be drunk, for I was sick at the Time, and I was under the Care of Dr. Dillon of Westport. I was upon my Bed, and I told him what a Noise they were making.

Timothy M'Carthy.

You are a Roman Catholic?
Yes.

Did they ever say any thing to you about that the Protestant Religion would soon be down?
I do not remember.

Did he ever say any thing about that the Country would soon be yours?
I heard them say that Ireland would be free once more, and that it would flourish; and there was loud cheering.

Were these Two Men alone when they were going on with this Conversation?
I do not doubt but a little Boy used to be in the House.

Were you there?
I was in the next Door.

And you heard it through the Wall?
Yes; and he came into my House.

Did you hear it through the Wall, or over the Wall?
I heard it over the Door.

Do you know where O'Donnell is now?
I do not.

Did you tell O'Donnell that you would report it?
Yes; he said, "Do your best; I have better Interest than you have."

Did you see him again afterwards?
I was near being injured by a Party of his, and I got removed out of it, and I came out of the County of Kerry.

Was that in consequence of having reported O'Donnell's Conduct?
I got sick there, and at the Time I went into Newport his Sister met me in the very Centre of the Town, and spat upon me, and called me all the Names she could call me; and there was a Party which, but for a Man of the Name of Moran, would have hurt me.

After you made the Report?
Yes.

And in consequence, as you believe, of that Report?
Yes.

Did you then apply to be removed from there?
Yes.

Was that Application in consequence of the Manner in which the People treated you?
I was afraid that they would hurt me there.

Have you seen O'Donnell since that Time?
I have not seen him since I was removed from there.

Do you know whether he was ever employed as a Schoolmaster in Achill?
I have heard of it, but I do not know it.

Can you speak Irish?
I can.

Do you understand it better than English?
It is very bad Irish I can speak; I cannot speak good Irish or good English.

How long have you been in the King's Service?
Sixteen Years at Christmas.

Had you and O'Donnell any Words or Quarrel together except upon this Occasion?
No.

You never had any Quarrel at all?
Not that I know of.

Did you ever see O'Donnell after he was dismissed?
I did before I was removed.

Did you ever hear him complain that he had no Investigation?
I did not.

Did he know why he was dismissed?
He did.

Who told him why he was dismissed?
John Rutledge told him.

Did you hear Rutledge tell him the Reason he was dismissed?
I heard him say he was dismissed.

For what Reason did he say?
For rebellious Speeches and abusing me as he did.

Did O'Donnell say any thing upon that Occasion?
I do not know what he said afterwards.

Did you ever hear of Steel-boys?
I have heard of White-boys.

Have you any Reason to suppose that O'Donnell had any thing to do with any Society of that Sort?
I do not know whether he had.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 21° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

J. Dombrain, Esq.

JAMES DOMBRAIN Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

You hold the Office of Inspector General of the Coast-guard in Ireland?
I do.

Were you ever in the Island of Achill officially?
Several Times.

In the course of the last Two Years?
I was there last Summer and the Year before.

Did you visit the Protestant Settlement there?
I did.

In what State did you find it; was it in a State different from the rest of the Island, or like the rest of the Island?
Very different from the rest of the Island.

Was it in a State inferior or superior?
Very superior.

In what respect?
Generally superior in respect of Industry and Cultivation; it had superior Buildings and every thing that would stamp an Appearance of Civilization in a very remote District.

As far, therefore, as appeared to you, it would be a great Blessing to the Island if the Example so set could be followed throughout that Island?
Decidedly.

Were you at all molested in going through the Island?
Not at all.

Had you any Reason to expect that you would be molested?
I left it very early in the Morning; as early as Seven o'Clock.

Upon what Occasion are you now speaking of?
In last June, when I was there on my official Visit of Inspection. Mr. Nangle and Mr. Baylee were both absent, and I never saw either of the Gentlemen, but natural Curiosity led me to visit the Settlement; and after remaining some Time looking over the Buildings I was about to leave it, after being there about Half an Hour, when one of the Coast-guard Men who accompanied me recommended me strongly not to think of doing so, for he said that I should be molested if the People of the Country knew that I came from the Settlement; however I was not deterred, and I was soon afterwards joined by Mr. Reynolds, and I walked over the Island with him without experiencing any Molestation.

Who is Mr. Reynolds?
The chief Officer of the Coast-guard Station at Keel, about Four Miles from the Settlement in Achill.

You of Course inspected the Coast-guard, that being your Object in going there?
Yes, I did.

J. Dombrain, Esq.

Did any thing remarkable come to your Knowledge?
Yes; it had been intimated to me that some very strong Language had been used by the Priest from the Altar, either on the previous Sunday, or the Sunday before that, in the Presence of some of the Coast-guard Men.

Did you call those Men?
I did; after the Inspection was over I called the Men forward, and before entering into the Particulars I told them that if any thing had occurred between them and their Priest connected with their Religion, or any thing of a Spiritual Character, I did not wish to hear it; but that if any thing had happened that was likely to compromise the Character of the Service, or its Efficiency or Discipline, or any thing likely to lead to a Breach of the Peace, which I had been given to understand the Words used were likely to do, then I thought they were bound to come forward and state it.

How many Men were there that you so called?
Two.

Were they Roman Catholics?
They were.

What were their Names?
Kelly and Donovan.

Who had given you that Information?
Mr. Reynolds.

Did they state any thing to you?
Yes; they stated that the Priest had been speaking from the Altar about the Protestant Colony, and that he had desired the Congregation generally to hoot and hiss at them wherever they met them, for that he would not be satisfied till he had driven them out of the Island.

When did you understand that this had been said?
Either the Sunday previous, or the Sunday before that.

This was in the course of the last Summer?
In the course of last Summer; in June last.

Were you ever applied to on the Part of the National Board of Education for Information respecting the Dismissal of James O'Donnell in 1831 or 1832?
I was.

Was the Application made to you personally or by Letter?
First it was made to my Office during my Absence, I believe personally, by Mr. Kelly, and subsequently by Mr. Carlile to myself.

What Information did you give upon that Occasion?
When Mr. Carlile came I told him that of course I was most anxious to give him every possible Information, and I immediately rang for the Papers, when he told me he had received a Report of Lieutenant Irwin, and asked me if there was any thing further; I told him I did not recollect any thing, but that if he would have the Kindness to write to me upon the Subject I would make every Inquiry in my Power, and give him every Information I could obtain.

When he said that he had seen a Report from Lieutenant Irwin, did you understand that he had seen the Report of Lieutenant Irwin contained in Page 15. No. 22. of the printed Papers before the Committee; is that the Letter to which you conceived he referred?
Yes.

Did you see the Letter at the Time?
I saw a Copy of it; Lieutenant Irwin gave me a Copy of it previously to that, when I was in the immediate Neighbourhood of his Station.

Do you know James O'Donnell yourself?
I do not.

Have you any Reports or Inquiries made on any Occasion, by Order of the Board of Customs, into the Conduct of any Officer of the Coast-guard of Achill, on a Complaint of Mr. Connolly?
Yes, I have several in my Possession.

Do those Reports, or does the Evidence taken on those Inquiries, at all relate to the Language or Conduct of Mr. Connolly with respect to the Protestant Settlement of Achill? *J. Dombrain, Esq.*

Yes, they do.

Are those the official Reports upon which the Decision of the different Authorities who decided upon that Occasion was formed?

Yes, they are.

Who were those Authorities?

The first was Captain Meame, who was directed by the Board of Customs, through me, to proceed to Achill, and to hold an Investigation. Then my own Report to the Comptroller General of the Coast-guard in London, and the Report of the Comptroller General to the Commissioners of Customs, with their final Decision upon it.

What were you to investigate?

The Charges preferred by Mr. Connolly against Mr. Reynolds, the Chief Officer at Keel.

You have been asked, whether there are any Parts of the Evidence taken on that Occasion that relate to the Language or Conduct of Mr. Connolly in respect to the Protestant Establishment in Achill, and you say there are. Did Charles Bridger give Evidence on any of those Occasions?

I think his Evidence is among the Papers.

If it is there, will you look at it, and say whether that is One of the Evidences that were taken upon that Inquiry?

I do not find Charles Bridger's Examination here.

Do you find the Evidence of Thomas M'Nulty and Thomas Ralph?

The Examinations of Thomas M'Nulty and Thomas Ralph are here.

Was the Evidence of Thomas M'Nulty and Thomas Ralph given in the Presence of Mr. Connolly, and subject to his Cross-examination?

It was.

Are those Two Reports official Reports of the Evidence?

Those are the official Reports; the original Reports.

Upon those, in connexion with the other Reports, the different Authorities came to a Decision in that Case?

Yes.

What were the Charges brought by Mr. Connolly against Mr. Reynolds?

They were very numerous; principally for interfering, as he stated, with his Flock, and entering into religious Controversy.

What was the Result of that Inquiry?

That the Commissioners of Customs did not consider that Mr. Reynolds had conducted himself with the Circumspection that ought to have marked his Conduct, but that, in consequence of the very high Character given of him, they merely admonished him to be cautious in future.

Then that Investigation was, with respect to Mr. Reynolds, on Charges produced against him by Mr. Connolly?

It was.

Was the Evidence of Thomas M'Nulty and Thomas Ralph on Oath?

It was not.

Had you the Power of administering an Oath?

The Officer had not the Power of administering an Oath.

It was given in the Presence of Mr. Connolly, and subject to his Cross-examination?

It was.

Do you know Thomas M'Nulty?

No, I do not.

J. Dombrain, Esq.

Do you know Thomas Ralph?
No, I do not.

Do you know John Rutledge?
Yes.

Have you seen him lately?
I have.

Have you known him long?
I have known him for Nine or Ten Years.

Are you of opinion that he is in a State to give Evidence before this Committee?
I should think most decidedly.

He has had a Wound?
I have heard so.

Have you seen him lately?
I have seen him very lately; he is waiting here.

And you are convinced that he is quite capable of giving Evidence before this Committee?
I should think so.

Have you had the same Opportunity of observing Rutledge that Lieutenant Irwin has had?
I think recently I have had more; Lieutenant Irwin has left the Station for some Time.

You think there is no Circumstance connected with his Health, and the Wound he has received, which makes him an incompetent Witness with reference to his Memory?
Certainly not. Of course my Communication with a Person of his Rank has not been very extensive; but I should say from what I have seen of him he is perfectly competent.

Do you think his Memory is perfectly unimpaired?
So far as I can judge; I have known very little of him, except meeting him upon the annual Inspection.

What was his Character as to Peaceableness and Veracity?
Very good. I never heard any thing to impeach it.

Do you know Mr. Reynolds?
I do.

What is your Opinion of Mr. Reynolds?
I believe Mr. Reynolds to be a very correct, steady, and good Officer.

And of course you would not consider him a steady, correct, and good Officer if you doubted his Honour, and the Veracity of any Statement that he made?
Not the least; he is one of the very last Men I should doubt.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

Charles Bridger.

CHARLES BRIDGER is called in, and examined as follows:

Are you Steward of the Missionary Settlement in Achill?
I am.

How long have you held that Office?
Since last August Twelvemonth.

Do you recollect the Time when Dr. M'Hale visited the Island of Achill?
Perfectly well.

Did you see any Procession in honour of his Arrival?
Yes.

In

Charles Bridger.

In that Procession did you see any thing remarkable carried by any Persons there?
I saw a Banner.

What was that?
I cannot exactly say what was written upon it; there were Words on it.

Do you know who carried it?
Not of my own Knowledge.

What Colour was it?
The Ground Colour was Green.

If certain Words that were said to be upon it were repeated to you should you know them?
I have heard the Words myself, but I was not near enough to see them.

At what Distance were you?
I suppose about from 100 to 200 Yards.

Do you know, of your own Knowledge, that in consequence of that Visit of Dr. M'Hale, and what may have taken place that Day, any of your Labourers refused any longer to take your Employment?
Yes, many.

Were you Steward of the Missionary Settlement at that Time?
I was.

Did they tell you that they went away on account of that?
They did.

Did they tell you that they had been forbidden to work any longer for you?
They did.

How many?
I cannot say the exact Number, but I could mention many.

Forbidden by whom?
By Mr. Connolly, the Parish Priest; and One Person in particular told me what the Bishop said.

Who was that Person?
His Name was Burke.

What did he tell you?
This Burke worked at the Settlement on the very Day that the Bishop arrived in Achill, and he was the next Day called on by his Father to go to the Bishop to make Confession, and he told me that Bishop M'Hale desired him not to work there any more.

Did he tell you whether this was said in the Chapel or not?
I rather think it was said in a private House, but I am not certain.

Is he a Roman Catholic?
He is.

Has he ever returned to your Employment?
He has returned since as a Workman occasionally, but not as a regular Labourer as before.

Have you found the Operations of the Settlement materially impeded by the Prohibition of the Priest Connolly, according to the Statements made to you by the Labourers?
As to the Labourers coming to work, we have.

But you have still some Roman Catholics?
We have.

Did they all leave you at that Time?
Yes; all the Roman Catholics.

Then have several of them returned since?
Several of them have returned since.

Charles Bridger.

Did you understand from them whether the Prohibition had been withdrawn?
I did not understand whether it had or not.

What Interval of Time elapsed between the Time of their withdrawing and the Time of their beginning to return?
I could not answer that accurately; I suppose about Three Months.

Did they return in small Numbers at first, or did a good many return at the same Time?
In small Numbers; we never had so many as we had before.

Did they appear unwilling to leave their Work when they first left it?
Certainly; they were very anxious till then to have whatever they could get.

Did they appear unwilling to leave the Work?
They said nothing as to that to me.

Had they had regular Work before you employed them?
No.

They were out of Work previous to that?
Yes.

And they came very eagerly to work with you?
They appeared very eager to work with us.

Were you able to get Men to supply their Place?
I was, by going to Westport, and paying them more Wages.

What were those with whom you supplied their Place, Catholics or Protestants?
Roman Catholics.

And they made no Difficulty?
No Difficulty.

How far did they come?
About Thirty-two Irish Miles.

Then you were obliged to procure a Lodging for them?
Yes; and Board.

Which you had not been obliged to do for the others?
Certainly not.

Under what Roman Catholic Bishop is Westport?
Under the same Bishop; the Bishop of Tuam.

Is that Dr. M'Hale?
It is.

Did it ever happen to you to have any Reason to apprehend Mischief to your Settlement, either before or subsequent to this, by any Indications to disturb you at the Settlement, or do any Injury to you, either before or after Dr. M'Hale's Visit to Achill?
I had only arrived in the Island just before Dr. M'Hale came.

After Dr. M'Hale's Visit was there ever any Appearance that caused Apprehension on your Part of Violence either to the Buildings or to the Persons employed about the Buildings, or to any of the Officers of the Settlement?
I know of none.

How long have these Westport People been employed by you?
They were employed Three Months.

During that Time Dr. M'Hale did not object to their working for you?
He did not; not that I know of.

Did you ever hear whether the Priest endeavoured to prevent the Westport Men working for you?
I never heard that he did.

Since

Since Dr. M'Hale's Visit have you been always able to go on peaceably with your Work? *Charles Bridger.*

Not at all. This Time Twelvemonth I had to bring Men from Westport; that was Seven or Eight Months after Dr. M'Hale came.

You understood that the Men that were replaced by the People at Westport were forbidden by their Priest to work for you?
By their Priest, Mr. Connolly.

Are you a Protestant?
I am.

What Part of Ireland do you belong to?
I belong to the South of England.

What induced you to go to this Part?
I wanted a Situation, and I went there.

How long had you been in Ireland before you went to Achill?
I cannot exactly say. I had been Ten or Eleven Years.

Who employed you to go to Achill?
The Committee of the Achill Mission in Dublin employed me.

Are you their Servant?
I am.

What do they pay you?
40*l.* a Year.

What is your Business?
To act as Land Steward over the Mission.

Have you ever received any Ill-usage from the People at Achill?
Not personally.

You are well known there?
I am.

And the People know what you are?
Yes.

Have you ever been hooted after?
Many Times.

But received no other Ill-usage?
No.

Are you employed as a Scripture Reader?
No, I am not.

How came you to join this Procession to meet Dr. M'Hale?
I did not join it; I was about 200 Yards off.

You were looking on?
I was.

Were there many People there?
There were a great Number.

How many?
I cannot say how many.

And you were never nearer than 200 Yards?
I think thereabout.

Did you feel any Apprehension of your own Safety?
No, I did not in the least.

Have you ever felt any Apprehension of your own Safety?
No; I never feel any Apprehension as to bodily Fear for myself.

You have not been threatened?
No, I do not know that I have ever been threatened.

Charles Bridger.

Was there any System of exclusive Dealing established in the Island?
Yes; they were regularly forbidden to sell to any Person living on the Settlement.

Who forbade them to sell to any Person living on the Settlement?
The People themselves told us that the Priest would not allow them to sell to us.

Did they refuse to sell?
They did.

They would not take the Money?
They would not take the Money; but upon one Occasion, this Time Twelvemonth, a Man came to me and offered me Seed Potatoes, and I mentioned to him that I was astonished that he would bring them to us to sell, and he said that he was going to be married, and that in consequence he wanted the Marriage Money for the Priest.

Did he say that he was permitted to sell for that Purpose?
He did.

That he had the Permission of the Priest for that Purpose?
He did not say from whom, but that he had Permission.

Were there any Debts due by the Persons on the Island to the Members of your Missionary Establishment that were not paid?
There are to me personally.

Who are they due by?
One Man's Name was Divor.

Did he give you any Reason why you were not paid?
He told me that the Priest desired him not to pay me. I offered him to come and earn it out, and he told me that the Priest desired him not to do it, but to let me process him, and that all I could do would be to send him to Gaol for a Month, and that I should have to pay him a Shilling a Day whilst he was in Gaol; but this Person came afterwards and paid me the Money, but the other Two never did.

Did the Person when he came to pay you say why he had come to pay you that?
He was always an honest Man, and I considered him so.

Then he considered it dishonest to obey the Orders of the Priest, not to pay you?
I do not know whether he considered it dishonest to obey the Priest's Order, but he considered it honest to pay me.

Did the Man himself state that he paid it because he was an honest Man?
No; but I thought him an honest Man.

Did you ask him why he paid you then, and why he refused to pay before?
No, I did not ask him any Question.

He was a Man that was forbidden to pay?
Yes.

Did they all Three tell you that they were forbidden to pay?
They did.

You were understood to say, that not only had no actual Violence been offered to the Officers or Labourers upon the Settlement, but that they were not under the Belief or Apprehension that any would be offered to them; is the Committee so to understand?
Not as to all the Officers on the Settlement, but as to myself personally.

Then are the Committee to understand, that after the Visit of Dr. M'Hale the Sentiments of the People were or were not so changed towards the Settlement as that they were or were not apprehensive of Violence after that Time?
I cannot answer whether the rest of the People on the Mission were appre-

hensive of Violence, but I say that some of them suffered, and even very lately, as I know, on the Road. *Charles Bridger.*

How did they suffer?
They were beaten.

Were any of them pelted with Stones at any Time?
Frequently.

Have any of your Works, or any of your Crops, ever been destroyed?
I cannot say that our Crops have been.

Have your Houses ever been attacked?
Not since I have been there.

There has been no Attempt to wreck the Settlement?
Not since I have been there.

Are Things quieter now than when you first went there?
I cannot say whether they are or not; the People are very violent.

Do they still continue to hoot at you?
They did not hoot me the last Time, when I was coming out upon this Journey; that is the only Time I ever passed without it.

When you say they are very violent, what do you mean by that?
When they beat one of our Men coming in, about a Month ago, I think that is Violence.

Did they hurt him much?
They broke his Nose.

Do you attend the Church where Mr. Nangle officiates?
Certainly; every Day.

You are a constant Attendant upon it?
I am.

Did you ever hear Mr. Nangle, from his Pulpit, say any thing to his People of an uncharitable Tone towards the Roman Catholics?
No; quite the Reverse.

Did you ever hear him, out of his Pulpit, in his private House or elsewhere, express to any Person any uncharitable Sentiments against his Roman Catholic Brethren?
No; quite the Reverse. His Object always was to make the People under him to love their Enemies as themselves.

Did you ever hear Mr. Nangle hold any violent Language upon the Subject of the Priests?
I never did; not any violent Language.

What have you heard Mr. Nangle say about the Roman Catholic Religion?
I have heard him often preaching upon the Roman Catholic Religion.

Have you heard him say it was superstitious?
I have.

Have you ever heard him say it was idolatrous?
I have.

Have you ever heard him say that the Persons that embraced it put their Salvation in danger?
I have.

Have you ever heard him accompany those Things so said with Advice to his People that they were to love their Enemies and not to curse them?
Always. When I heard him preaching, and mentioning the Words now put to me, I always heard him at the latter End telling them not to hate them personally, but still to abhor the Sin of their Religion, and to love them.

And to be kind to them in their Dealings?
Exactly so.

Charles Bridger.

Did he ever notice to them the Conduct of the other People towards them?

Yes; I have heard him just noticing that to them, and tell them not by any means to take pattern by it.

Did you ever go into a Roman Catholic Chapel there?
No, I never did.

You say he said this at the End; you mean at the End of the Sermon?
Yes; at the latter End of the Sermon always.

He preaches in Irish?
In English and Irish both.

Do you understand Irish?
Not perfectly, but I understand a little.

You say at the End of the Sermon; do you mean that Mr. Nangle's Advice to them, to be kind to the Persons and loving to the Persons, followed soon after what he had said so adverse to their Religion?
Yes; after stating the Errors which Mr. Nangle considered to be in the Roman Catholic Religion, he always mentioned the Propriety of Kindness to them.

Were there any Roman Catholics present during his Sermons?
Very often.

Did they say any thing, as if they were hurt at what Mr. Nangle said?
I never heard them.

Did the Roman Catholic Persons there ever show to you any Feeling of Regret that they were driven to violent Conduct towards Mr. Nangle or others?
No, they never did.

You never heard them say that they were sorry for it?
I never did.

You say you could not mention the Number that constituted the Procession that went to meet Dr. M'Hale; can you say nearly what was the Population of the Island?
I am not aware of it.

Was the Procession peaceable or tumultuous?
With the Exception of hooting as they passed our Settlement, I saw no other Act of Violence.

On this Occasion they hooted as they passed the Settlement?
Yes, they did.

With Dr. M'Hale?
I am not sure whether Dr. M'Hale was actually in the Procession at this Time or not, but there were many Priests.

Was Mr. Connolly there?
I cannot say exactly.

Do you know whether Dr. M'Hale was ever there before?
Not in my Time.

Had there been any Opposition to the Settlement before Dr. M'Hale came there?
I had just arrived at the Time.

How do you know there were many Priests in the Procession?
Because I saw them; I knew them by their Dress.

How many Priests are there in the Island?
Two.

Then those other Priests came with the Doctor?
They did.

How long had you been in the Island before Dr. M'Hale came?
I should think about a Month or Five Weeks.

Had you found any Difficulty in getting Workmen before?
Not the least.

Charles Bridger.

Had you found an Anxiety on the Part of the People to come for Work?
Very great.

How long had Mr. Nangle been there before Dr. M'Hale came?
I cannot exactly say.

How much Land have you been able to reclaim since you have been there?
I should think about Twenty Acres since I have been there; perhaps more.

When the People hooted you, did they use abusive Language?
No, nothing more than hooting.

Do you mean to say that when you have wished to purchase Articles, and have had the Money to pay for them, People would not really furnish you with the Articles?
Yes.

Shopkeepers and Farmers?
Farmers; there are no such Things as Shops in the Island.

Then how did you manage to procure the Necessaries of Life?
By getting them from Westport.

A Distance of Thirty-two Irish Miles?
Yes.

As you are an Englishman can you say how many Miles English that would be?
I believe about Forty.

Westport is on the main Land?
It is.

What is the nearest Town containing Shops?
Newport.

How many Miles off is that?
I believe Twenty-seven Irish Miles.

Why did not you send there?
Because Westport is a better Market Town; there are very few Shops in Newport.

Did the System adopted by Dr. M'Hale and the Priest in the Island occasion to the Society of which you are Steward additional Expense in the carrying on their Objects?
Yes.

In what Way?
In Labour particularly.

And in other Ways besides?
Yes, and in other Ways, in consequence of stopping the Sale of Provisions.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THOMAS RALPH is called in, and examined as follows:

Thomas Ralph.

What are you?
I am a Protestant.

What is your Occupation?
My Occupation is a Scripture Reader.

Who employs you as a Scripture Reader?
The Reverend Mr. Nangle.

Do you receive Payment as such?
Yes.

Thomas Ralph.

What Salary do you receive?
24*l.* a Year.

Have you always been a Protestant?
No; I was brought up in the Church of Rome.

When did you become a Protestant?
In the Year 1824.

What was your Reason for leaving the Church of Rome?
By reading the Scriptures, and taking Notice; that I did not like their Mode of Worship; that it was not according to the Scripture.

Where were you first employed as a Scripture Reader?
I was first employed by Mr. Blest; I continued a Reader under his Superintendence for a Time.

Where was this?
Mr. Blest lived in Sligo at that Time.

When were you first employed as a Scripture Reader in the Island of Achill?
I believe it was last January Three Years.

That was in January 1834?
Yes.

Who employed you in 1834 as a Scripture Reader?
The Reverend Mr. Nangle.

And you have been in his Employment as such ever since?
Yes.

You have been a Protestant for Thirteen Years; ever since the Year 1824?
Yes.

What brought you to Achill first?
I was employed by the Reverend Mr. Nangle as Scripture Reader.

He induced you to come into the Island of Achill?
Yes, he brought me there.

Did you know Mr. Nangle before you went to Achill?
I did; I met him near the Town of Ballinor.

Do you recollect the Time when Dr. M'Hale visited Achill?
Yes, I do; but I do not exactly know the Time; I think it was in December in the Year 1835.

Did you see any Procession at that Time in honour of him?
Yes, I happened to come to the Chapel where they were collected.

Did you see the People go out to meet him or bring him in?
At the Time I went there they were in the Chapel.

You went to the Chapel where the People were?
Yes.

Did you see Dr. M'Hale in the Chapel?
I did.

Did you see Mr. Connolly in the Chapel?
I did.

Did you see the other Priests of the Island in the Chapel?
I believe he had a Curate; I think he was there.

Did you hear Mr. Connolly preach or say any thing in that Chapel?
I did.

Did you hear him say any thing concerning the Protestant Religion?
I did.

What did he say?
For One Thing he said, that the Protestant Religion began in Hell, and that it would end in Hell.

Thomas Ralph.

Did he say any thing about the Salvation of Protestants?
No, I did not hear him say any thing about that.

Did he say whether they would be finally lost or not?
That was what he was about. What he was saying was, that that Religion had no Foundation; that it was a new Religion from the Time of Luther, Calvin, and so on; and that it began in Hell and that it would end in Hell.

Did he say any thing that meant that Persons who belonged to the Protestant Religion would go to Hell, or not?
Yes, he did say that they would go to Hell; and before I left the Church of Rome I often heard that said by Priests.

Did he say any thing about Persons who worked for the Protestant Settlement?
He did.

What did he say?
He was blaming those People for going to work there, and represented them as one going before the Devil, and the Devil having Two Half Crowns on his Two Horns; and that the Man that would go to work there was just completely equal to the Man that would take down the Half Crowns from the Devil's Horns, and fall down and worship him or thank him.

Did he say that as a Reason to deter Persons from working at the Protestant Settlement?
He did; that is my Opinion.

Did it appear to you at the Time clearly that that was his Meaning?
Yes; I know it was.

Did he at the same Time forbid Persons to sell to the Protestant Settlement?
Yes, he did; he told them not to have any Communication with them, not to buy or sell, nor even speak a Word with them.

Did you hear him say that?
I did.

Did he say any thing about sending Children to Mr. Nangle's Schools?
I do not know indeed.

Did Dr. M'Hale say any thing when this Sermon was over?
He got up, and it seemed to me that he confirmed this, or approved of what he heard, in some Words that I cannot recollect now.

He got up and signified his Approval?
Yes.

You have attended Mr. Nangle when he has preached?
Yes.

Did you ever hear Mr. Nangle say any thing about the Way in which it was the Duty of his People to behave to the Roman Catholics?
Yes; I often heard Mr. Nangle preach that we should treat them as our Friends, though being our Enemies, and so on, and should pray for them; and so I have heard Mr. Nangle himself do the same.

Did you ever hear Mr. Connolly say any thing about a Man named Murray?
No, I did not.

Were you ever treated with Violence in the Island of Achill?
I was; every Day we are treated in that Way; I could not describe about that; almost every Day that we go out we are treated in that Way; shouting and hooting and throwing Stones after us, and calling us Names, and calling us Devils.

Was ever a Stone thrown at you?
Yes.

Did ever a Stone hit you?
Not to my Recollection.

Thomas Ralph.

You probably would recollect if a Stone had hit you?
Yes.

Did you deem it necessary to have some one with you when you went out, to keep each other from being hurt?
Yes, I would think it necessary that Two should go out together.

You think it necessary for Two always to go together for protecting each other?
Yes.

Should not you venture to go out by yourself?
We take the Example that our Lord and Saviour laid down, to go out Two and Two; we go by that Example.

Then you never have been in the habit of going out alone?
Seldom indeed I went out alone since I came to Achill,

But you have sometimes?
I would go out to near Neighbours.

Would you be afraid to go alone?
I would be afraid. The only Reason that I would not be afraid is, that it is not merely looking to the Law of the Land, but looking to the Lord of Heaven and Earth; but we must look to the Law of the Land too.

Do you think they would kill you?
They would kill me, and would think they were doing God Service in killing me.

Do you think the Law of the Land is sufficiently strong in Achill to protect you?
No, without God's Hand being upon us; without the Lord standing by me; but I know the Law of the Land is commanded by God himself, and that we ought to look to the Law of the Land.

Do you speak Irish?
Yes.

Do you preach in Irish?
I do not preach at all; I simply read God's Word.

But when you read the Scripture, and converse upon it, do you speak Irish or English?
It is in the Irish that I generally read in Achill.

You were examined before Captain Neame?
I was.

Was Mr. Connolly present at the Time?
He was.

Did you there state what you have now stated, respecting his preaching when Dr. M'Hale was present?
Yes.

Did Mr. Connolly ask you any Questions as to whether it was true or not?
I do not know whether he did or not.

Did he contradict you upon it?
No.

How did you happen to be in the Chapel to hear Mr. Connolly state this?
It is my Business to go out every Day reading God's Word to People; I went there to see whether I could get a good Sermon from Bishop M'Hale; I thought it as well to go the Way to the Chapel as any other Way, and so I went in there.

Are you a married Man?
Yes.

Is your Wife a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?
She was a Roman Catholic once, but, thank the Lord, she is not so now.

Thomas Ralph.

You were not afraid to go to the Chapel upon that Day?
If I would be afraid to go out, that would not do, I must go out.

Did the People know in the Chapel that you were a converted Roman Catholic?
They do in all Parts of the Island wherever I go.

When you were in the Chapel that Day, was it publicly known that you were there?
It was.

And you met with no Molestation there?
No; but at the Time that I was hearing the Sermon I watched an Opportunity of walking out of the Chapel. I knew that whilst I was in the Chapel nothing would harm me; but I watched an Opportunity, and when I got out I made speed. I knew the Plan well.

You having been once a Roman Catholic knew the Plan well. You knew from Experience that no Violence would be offered to you in the Chapel while the Service was going on, and you knew that the Danger would be when the Service was over; and in consequence of that Knowledge you took an Opportunity and went away before the Service was over?
Yes.

Was that Chapel at Ducanally?
It was.

Were you ever afterwards reproached with having been in the Chapel by any of the People who had seen you there, knowing who you were?
Though I cannot make mention of those Men, some of them, after coming Home, told me that if I had tarried there for any more Time I should have been injured.

After their so telling you, did you go again into the Chapel?
No, I have not been in the Chapel since.

Do not you frequently go into a Roman Catholic Chapel?
No, I have not gone since.

You have not been into a Roman Catholic Chapel since the Time when you went into Ducanally Chapel when Dr. M'Hale was there?
No.

Who went into that Chapel with you at that Time?
It was one John Gardiner.

Was he one of your Mission?
He was.

Had he been a Roman Catholic himself?
No; he was a Protestant from his Youth.

Did you go into that Chapel with the Intention of giving any Religious Advice to any Persons there?
I knew well that there would not be any Opportunity of doing that. I had an Intention of going in to hear Bishop M'Hale preach a Sermon. My Object was to see if they had mended in their Religious Service since the Time I left them.

Did Bishop M'Hale say any thing about the Scripture Readers?
I did not hear him say any thing about them.

Was it Mr. Connolly or Bishop M'Hale that preached that Day?
Two Priests preached; it was not Mr. Connolly that was preaching when I went in. The Mass was over, and the preaching was going on when I went in there, and I did not know the Priest.

It was not Dr. M'Hale that preached?
No, it was not.

But Dr. M'Hale got up at the End, and expressed his Concurrence?
Yes.

Thomas Ralph.

When he got up did he say any thing about the Scripture Readers?
I do not recollect that he mentioned Scripture Readers.

How many Scripture Readers has Mr. Nangle got in Achill?
Four of them.

What is your Business as a Scripture Reader; what is it you do?
Just to go out and read God's Word to the People in a Language that they can understand.

What is it you read; the Old Testament or the New Testament?
Both of them.

Any Part of the Bible that you choose?
Yes; but there are certain Portions that we generally read to the People, pointing out the Sufficiency of the Saviour.

Who points them out to you?
We know them very well ourselves.

You choose what Parts you please?
We are commanded to read those Passages which show the Sufficiency of the Lord Jesus Christ to the People.

Do you choose them yourselves, or are they pointed out to you before by another Person?
I choose them.

Does Mr. Nangle never point out to you what you are to read to the People?
Yes, sometimes; he knows that I keep a Journal. I must let Mr. Nangle know what I read to the People.

When you have read a Passage do you expound it and explain it?
The Passage is so plain that it needs no Commentary.

It wants no Explanation?
I think not. I do not say that I would be qualified enough to give an Explanation.

In what Place is it that you read these Passages to the People?
About the Villages.

Is it in the Street?
Those few that will allow us into their Houses, we read to them.

You desire them to let you into their Houses for the Purpose?
Yes; we ask Leave to read to them.

And when they refuse, you do not go in?
No, we do not go in if they refuse.

Do you read in the Streets to them?
Just as we get an Opportunity.

Do you read to Crowds or to Individuals?
Just as we meet them.

Do you tell them the Difference between the Catholic and Protestant Religion?
I tell them Salvation is by Christ alone.

Do you tell them that the Views of the Roman Catholics are false?
I would not wish to abuse any Religion in that Way, but just show them their own Error, that they do not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

You are satisfied with pointing out what you believe to be the Truth, without talking to them about their own Error; is that so?
Yes, that is what I mean.

Do not the Roman Catholics believe in the Lord Jesus Christ?
When I was a Roman Catholic I believed in many Things besides that.

Thomas Ralph.

Do you know the Inspector of the National School, Mr. Kelly, who came there last Summer to inspect the National School?
No, I do not.

You do not recollect meeting him?
I do not recollect meeting him.

You know Mr. Connolly?
Yes.

Do you remember meeting him with another Gentleman there, and following them?
No, I do not.

Are there several Scripture Readers in Achill?
There are Four.

When you read the Scriptures to the People do they ever ask you Questions about it?
Sometimes.

Do you answer those Questions?
As well as the Lord shows me.

Do you wait to be invited by Persons to talk with them upon these Subjects, or do you offer yourself to them?
We would begin to speak to each other of the Saviour, and so on.

You begin then to speak to such Persons as you meet with upon this Subject?
As they would give me Leave.

If you find them unwilling to receive you, do you stay there, or go away?
I would withdraw.

When you were in the Chapel was it in the Sermon that you heard the Declaration that the Protestant Religion began in Hell and would end in Hell?
It was.

Were you rightly understood to say that it was not Mr. Connolly that preached that Sermon; did you not say that you did not know the Person that preached?
There was one preached before Mr. Connolly; but it was Mr. Connolly that made mention of those Words.

In what Language?
In the Irish.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Thomas M'Nulty.

THOMAS M'NULTY is called in, and examined as follows:

Are you a Bible Reader?
I read a little sometimes.

You are not employed by Mr. Nangle to go about as a Bible Reader?
No.

What are you?
I am a Labourer.

Do you work for the Protestant Settlement at Achill?
I do.

Are you a Protestant?
Yes.

Were you always a Protestant?
No.

Thomas M'Nulty.

What were you before you were a Protestant?
I was a Roman Catholic.

When did you become a Protestant?
Last August Twelvemonth.

What induced you to become a Protestant?
I thought it was the best Religion.

Are you a Native of Achill?
No.

What brought you to Achill?
Mr. Bridger went there, and took me there first as a Servant Boy.

He is the Steward of the Settlement?
He is.

Were you a Roman Catholic when you came into Achill?
I was.

Were you ever in the Chapel of Ducanally in the Island of Achill?
I was.

Were you in the habit of attending in that Chapel?
I attended once on Sunday.

You were a Roman Catholic at that Time?
I was.

Who was the Priest that officiated when you went there?
The Rev. Mr. Connolly.

Do you recollect any Advice he gave to the People at that Time?
Yes, I do.

Was it in his Sermon?
Yes.

What did he say?
He gave Orders to his Congregation, that any Person, Protestant or Reader, from the Settlement, who would come to them to the Field where they were at work, whatever they would have in their Hand, if it was a Spade, to strike them with it; and he likewise told them, if they went to their Houses, if it was a Pitchfork they had in their Hands, to stick them.

How soon after that Sunday did you become a Protestant?
At this Time my Master went to Westport, and I went, unknown to him, that Sunday, to Mass. I was a Roman Catholic then.

Did your Master think you were a Protestant?
No.

How soon after that did you become a Protestant?
I cannot say how long it was after that Time; but I did not go to Mass after that.

Why do you say you went unknown to your Master?
Because he went from Home,—he went to Westport,—and because I had so much Business to do at Home I would have to stop at Home.

Did he tell you not to go to Mass?
No, he never did.

Had he any Objection to your going to Mass?
No. I had been with him Four Years before that.

Was it on a Sunday that you went?
It was.

Was your Work so pressing that you could not leave Home to go to your Place of Worship on Sunday without his Permission?
No.

Then why was it necessary for you to go without his Knowledge?
My Master was away.

Thomas M'Nulty.

You said you had so much Work to do?
He was not married at the Time, and there was no one in the House but me.

Then you felt that it was necessary to stay at Home to take care of the House?
Yes.

In this Sermon that you heard did Mr. Connolly say any thing about a Man named Murray?
He did. He said to his Congregation: "You dirty Set, I am tired of you; to see that Devil, Murray, going about like a Wasp, having a Sting on his Mouth just to sting the People; a Man that was hunted and hooted out of every Place that ever he was in, till he came into the Borough, and there he is."

What did you understand him to mean by the "Borough"?
That he was in the Settlement; and there he was.

By the "Borough," you understood him to mean the Settlement?
Yes.

Did he say any thing about Murray being a Man who would or would not be suffered to live in any Place but Achill?
He said that he was hunted out of every Place that he was in till he was hunted into the Borough, and there he was.

Did you ever hear Mr. Connolly tell his Congregation that they should persecute the Protestants generally?
I did. I heard him say that which I said before.

Have you attended Mr. Nangle's Sermons often?
I have.

Have you ever heard him tell his People how they should behave to the Roman Catholics?
I heard him say that they ought to return Good for Evil.

Where do you live now?
In Achill.

Were you examined before Captain Neame?
I was.

Did you say at that Time what you have now said, about the Language of Mr. Connolly in his Sermon?
I did.

Was Mr. Connolly present?
He was.

Did Mr. Connolly contradict it?
No, he did not that I know.

So long as you were present he said nothing in contradiction?
He said nothing. I told him the Language he had expressed from his Altar, and he did not say any thing against it. Captain Irwin was there.

Was this Language that you heard in the Sermon against the Protestants, in any Degree the Cause of your leaving the Roman Catholics?
It was a good deal of it. I thought it was not a fit Thing for a Man who professed to be a Minister of Christ to give his People such Orders from his Altar.

Do you know whether there are any Schools in Achill?
I know there are.

Connected with the National Board?
Yes.

How many?
In the Neighbourhood that I am in, we have a School in our Settlement, and a School in the next Village of Dugort.

Thomas M'Nulty.

Does the School in your Settlement belong to the National Board?
No, it does not.

Have you a House of your own in Achill?
I have got a House there within these last Two Months.

Belonging to yourself?
No; it belongs to Mr. Nangle; he bought it; he has some Land there; there are labouring Men that go to that House when they go to work there.

Do you pay any Rent for it?
No; Mr. Nangle pays the Rent for it.

Are you a Servant still to the same Person?
No; I am working now for myself.

Have you some Land of your own?
No.

Were you a Labourer before you became a Protestant?
I was.

What Wages do you receive as a Labourer now?
A Shilling a Day.

And a House?
Yes.

Have you any Garden.
No.

Did you ever receive any Ill-usage from any Body in Achill?
There is not a Time that I have passed by that I was not shouted after, after I left the Church of Rome.

Were you ever beaten?
No.

You never received any personal Injury?
No, not beyond shouting and telling the People not to give me any thing that I wanted to buy.

They never beat you or threw Stones at you?
No.

Do you find now any Difficulty in purchasing Things that you want in the Island?
The first Time that I went to that Place the People there that had Things to sell would not sell them to me, but they gave them to another Roman Catholic about the Place, and I would meet that Man and buy them of him; they would dread themselves to sell them to me.

Is that the Case now?
Not since I have been there.

Are you obliged to buy indirectly in that Manner of another Person?
Yes.

But it is sent to that Person for the Purpose of being sold to you?
Yes.

Before you became a Protestant were you ever told by the Priest, or any other Roman Catholic, that you ought to leave the Settlement, and have nothing to do with the Protestants there?
No; except by the Country People.

What is the usual Rate of Wages in Achill per Day?
8*d.* a Day.

Do the Roman Catholics work for 8*d.*?
They were afraid to work there for 8*d.* a Day. They said sometimes that they would not work there at all; they were afraid of the Priest.

Do the People earn 8*d.* a Day in general in Achill?
They do in general.

4419

Thomas M'Nulty.

Do all the Labourers at the Missionary Settlement get 1*s.* a Day?
No.

Why do you get more than others?
Because I was a Steward with the Men that were there in another Island.

Were the Directions from the Priest to strike any one belonging to the Mission with a Spade or with a Pitchfork, or was it confined to the Scripture Readers?
It was to any of the Readers or Preachers, or any of the Colony.

Had you no Apprehension that you would be struck?
I was often in dread that I would be struck.

Was any of them ever struck with a Spade or a Pitchfork?
That I do not know.

At the Time when you were a Roman Catholic, would you have considered yourself bound to obey such a Direction of the Priest?
I would; I would be afraid not to obey it.

Then how can you account for it that in a Population of 5,000 Men not One of those 5,000 Men who inhabit the Island of Achill obeyed that Direction of the Priest, to your Knowledge, though you say you would have obeyed it when you were a Roman Catholic?
That I do not know.

You said that the Priest told them that they were to strike with the first Weapon that they had, if they should attempt to speak to them, any Person connected with the Settlement; but you did not understand him that unless the People of the Settlement went into their Houses they were to be struck in this Way?
No; he gave them Orders that if they would come to their Houses they were to stick them.

And if they should speak with them in the open Air what were they then to do?
To strike them with whatever they had in their Hand.

Did you understand that to mean, if they were to speak to them about their Religion, or if they were to speak to them at all?
Yes.

Whether it was about Religion or any thing else?
Yes.

In consequence of that do you know whether the People of the Settlement did or did not go freely into the Houses of the Roman Catholics in Achill, and talk freely with them?
I know that they were willing to talk freely with them. I was going down the Sea-shore one Evening, and there was a Man, one of the Readers, who spoke to a Man in the Middle of the Road, and I saw him strike him.

And you considered the Man, when you saw him strike, acting in obedience to what the Priest had told him in the Chapel?
I think so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. F. Reynolds.

Mr. FRANCIS REYNOLDS is called in, and examined as follows:

You are an Officer of the Coast-guard?
I am.

Are you in His Majesty's Navy?
No.

What is your Office?
I am the Civilian Chief Officer of the Coast-guard in the Island of Achill.

Mr. F. Reynolds.

As such are you obliged occasionally to give Orders to the Men under your Command to protect any Persons?
I have been obliged frequently to give Orders to them to protect the People of the Protestant Settlement, Mr. Nangle and Mr. Baylee.

In consequence of what has come to your Knowledge officially?
Yes; and from what I have seen.

Are you a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?
I am a Protestant.

Are you married?
I am.

Is your Wife a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?
She is a Roman Catholic.

Did you, in consequence of any thing that she told you of what she had heard from the Priest in the Chapel, think it necessary to take any Steps?
I did.

What had she told you?
She told me that she heard the Priest say that he would banish Mr. Nangle and Mr. Stoney, and any Man that would take their Part; and it was their Intention to drive the Protestants out of that Island.

How long have you been in Achill?
I have been in Achill this last Time Six Years.

Had you ever been there before?
I had, for Three Years.

What Interval was there between the Two Times of Residence?
About Three Years.

You were there, therefore, when Mr. Nangle came in 1834?
I was.

Did you see any Improvement produced in the Island?
I did. I saw a great Improvement in the Cultivation of the Land, and also in having Schools for the Instruction of the Children.

Did the People testify any Feeling towards Mr. Nangle at that Time?
They always appeared to me at the Time to be very fond of Mr. Nangle, and to like him very much.

When were the first Indications of a different Feeling towards Mr. Nangle?
When the Priest gave Orders to shout after the Protestants whenever they saw them.

What Priest?
Mr. Connolly.

About what Time was that?
I think it was in March 1836, but I am not quite certain as to the Date.

Was it before or after Dr. M'Hale's Visit?
I think it was after Dr. M'Hale's Visit that the greatest Persecution was carried on.

Had any thing taken place in the Way of Persecution before?
Yes.

When did Mr. Connolly come into the Island?
I think in either February or March 1836, but I am not quite certain of that.

Might it have been 1835?
It might.

Do you recollect when Dr. M'Hale came?
I think it was in August or September in the Year before last.

Was Mr. Connolly there before Dr. M'Hale came?
He was.

Mr. F. Reynolds.

Then if he came there before Dr. M'Hale, and Dr. M'Hale came there in September 1835, must it not have been in the March before that?
Then it must have been in the March before that.

Did you have officially reported to you any thing by Thomas Williams in the Autumn of last Year?
Yes; Thomas Williams reported to me on the 30th of October, on the Sunday, that there were Four New Testaments burnt by a Man named Lavelle, and that Two of them were flung into his House.

Who is James Lavelle?
A Man that acts as the Clerk to Mr. Connolly the Priest; they were Half burnt; there was "Hibernian Society" marked upon them.

On what Terms do you yourself live with the respectable Roman Catholic Inhabitants of the Island?
I have been on very good Terms with them all, except a very few; I never had any Dispute with any Person in the Island.

Did they attend or not attend to the Direction of the Priest to abstain from all Communication with the Protestants?
No; they always said they were ashamed of such Work.

There are some respectable Roman Catholics in the Island?
Yes; respectable People, that are of better Order than the rest.

Then an Obedience is paid to the Priest, in respect to refusing to have Conversation with Protestants, only by the lower Order of the People?
So far as I understand.

You do not find in the great Body of the Roman Catholics of respectable Station of Life any Disinclination to converse with you?
Not the slightest.

Are there many Persons in a respectable Station of Life in the Island?
Yes; there are a great many what we consider respectable People in the Island.

But the great Multitude of the People were obedient, as far as you know, to the Priest's Orders?
They were, because I witnessed it myself.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

John Rutledge.

JOHN RUTLEDGE is called in, and examined as follows:

Are you a Coast-guard Man at Achill?
Yes.

Have you long been so employed?
Eighteen Years in the Service.

In the Month of October 1831 had you charge of the Coast-guard Station of Rossmore Point?
Yes.

Do you know Timothy M'Carthy?
Yes.

Did he report to you any thing respecting the Conduct of James O'Donnell?
Yes, he did.

Is that James O'Donnell the James O'Donnell who is the Schoolmaster at the National School at Dugort?
I do not know whether he is there at present or not; he was there.

He is the Man that was a Schoolmaster there?
Yes, he was.

What did M'Carthy report to you as having been said or done by O'Donnell?
As near as I can recollect, the Report was that Ireland would soon be their

John Rutledge.

own, and O'Connell would be their King; I can recollect no more than that of the Speech, it is so long since.

Did you report this to your superior Officer?
Yes; I reported it to Lieutenant Irwin, the Inspecting Commander.

Before this, had you ever heard O'Donnell say any thing else?
Previous to that I heard him make a Kind of a Speech; I heard him say that he thanked his God that he would soon see the Day that they would trample down the Protestant Church, and that their own Church would flourish again, which had been persecuted.

Who wrote that Paper from which you are reading?
I wrote it myself.

When did you write it?
Since I came here.

Why did you write it?
To recollect. I have a very bad Memory; it is on account of the Wound I received on my Head in the Service.

Are you quite sure that O'Donnell said what you have now stated?
What I have now said I am willing to make Oath to.

Did you write that at the Desire of any other Person?
No; just for my own Information.

Did you warn O'Donnell at all?
I threatened him before that to report him. It was Two Days before he made this Speech that he was complained of by M'Carthy.

To whom did you report this?
To the Inspecting Commander.

Who was that Inspecting Commander?
Lieutenant Irwin.

Did you ever receive any Threat from O'Donnell?
By some of his Relations I did, in Newport, at different Times; and I should have been ill-used by them only for other People interfering.

Was that before or after you had reported him?
After he was reported and discharged.

What was the Threat?
To beat me for getting him discharged. He thought it was through me that he was discharged from the Coast-guard Service.

Where was it that he made this Speech that you have repeated now?
Convenient to his own House; it might be, I suppose, about Fifty Yards from my Dwelling.

You did not hear him yourself?
I heard him, but I was at a Distance off, that I did not know what he said.

Whom did he say it to?
It was to one Kelly, that was transported.

Was it in a House or out of doors?
I understood it was both inside and outside.

There was nobody else there; there was not a Multitude of People there?
No, there was not.

Who told you what it was that he said?
It was M'Carthy.

Where was M'Carthy at the Time?
He was listening; the Doors were close to one another.

They lived under One Roof, did they not?
They did.

John Rutledge.

Was not it inside the House?
M'Carthy says that he spoke some of it inside and some outside; he told me that.

Is M'Carthy a Roman Catholic?
Yes, he is.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. James Kelly.

Mr. JAMES KELLY is called in, and examined as follows:

You are an Inspector under the National Board?
I am.

Have you ever, as Inspector, visited Achill in consequence of Complaints against the Teacher of the Dugort National School?
I have.

When was that?
The first Investigation took place on the 24th of October 1835, the Date of my first Report.

On that same Day?
On that Day it took place.

When you went there who was the first Person that you went to?
I went to Mr. Connolly in the first instance.

Why did you go first to him?
He is the Manager and Correspondent for those Schools.

Had you given any previous Notice to Mr. Nangle of your Intention of visiting in consequence of his Complaints?
Not at that Time.

At that Time you did not give to Mr. Nangle any Notice of your Intention of coming to inquire into the Matter of his Complaints?
Not at that Time.

And the first Person you went to was Mr. Connolly?
Yes.

Did Mr. Connolly send for O'Donnell?
No, he did not; I went to the Schools.

Did you tell Mr. Connolly what the Complaints were?
I think I stated to him that there were Complaints against O'Donnell.

Did you tell him what the Complaints were?
I am not quite certain.

Wherefore should you go to the Patron and Correspondent of the School first, except to let him know what the Complaints against the Master were?
I am not quite certain that I went into all the Details of those Complaints to Mr. Connolly, but I told him generally that there were some Complaints against O'Donnell.

Did you show Mr. Connolly the Letter of Mr. Nangle to the Secretary of the Board that contained those Complaints?
No, I did not.

Were you directed by the Board to go in the first instance to Mr. Connolly?
Certainly not; I received no Instructions upon that Point, as to calling on Mr. Connolly.

Will you look at your Report, No. 23. in the printed Correspondence. The second Paragraph there gives an Account of your Report upon the first Subject of Complaint?
It does.

Mr. James Kelly.

Will you read it?

"O'Donnell admits that on the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island, met him with Green Boughs, &c. &c., but that in doing so he was ignorant of any Violation of the Rules of the Board."

You went afterwards to Mr. Nangle?
I did.

What did you tell Mr. Nangle respecting the first Charge?
I told him that O'Donnell admitted and pleaded guilty to the first Charge, that is, with regard to going with the People to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Visit to Achill.

You will see that the Complaint was that O'Donnell bore a Flag with the Inscription "Welcome Religion and Liberty." That was the first Charge; and you say that you told Mr. Nangle that O'Donnell had pleaded guilty to that Charge?
I do not think I got a Copy of Mr. Nangle's Letter; I was directed to go there and inquire into those Complaints.

What Letter had you?
A Letter from the Secretary directing me to go there and inquire into the Complaints against O'Donnell.

Have you got that Letter?
No, I think not.

Then you have no Copy of your Instructions?
No, not with me at present.

Were they written Instructions?
They were; it was a written Letter.

Did the Letter contain the Charges made against O'Donnell by Mr. Nangle?
Generally, I think.

But not specifically?
I rather think not specifically.

Is that the usual Course adopted by the Board when it instructs its Inspectors to investigate Charges against the Masters employed?
On a subsequent Occasion I know that the Charges were specified.

Is it the usual Course of the Board to send an Inspector to investigate Charges without giving him a Specification of the Charges?
I should think not. The Direction that I received in that Instance was to investigate Charges against O'Donnell, and to receive them from Mr. Nangle. Then the Letter went on to speak generally of those Charges, I think.

What did the Letter say generally of those Charges?
It said that O'Donnell was charged with having on the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit met him with Green Boughs, &c. That was One Charge.

Is the Paper from which you are now reading the Letter you received from the Secretary?
No, it is my Report. The Reason I referred to this Paper is that I investigated all the Charges contained in the Secretary's Letter as they appear here.

Will you state what the other Charges were?
The Second was that he had controversial Discussions with Mr. Nangle's Readers or Preachers.

What was the Third Charge?
That O'Donnell threatened to cut off the Head of a Child going to Mr. Nangle's School.

Were these all the Charges that were mentioned, or was there any thing about O'Donnell having been once in the Coast-guard, and dismissed on account of being implicated in Ribbonism?
No; that was not mentioned; that was the Subject of a subsequent Inquiry.

Mr. James Kelly.

Is that the usual Way in which the Board proceeds in respect of the Charges brought against its Teachers; does it give specifically the Charges that are said to have been brought, or only deal with them generally, in the Way you have stated?

I cannot answer as to the general Usage of the Board.

Have you ever been engaged in any similar Investigation?

I think this was the first Case.

Have you been engaged in any since?

Yes, on One Occasion.

Then, as far as you recollect, you never were employed by the Board, except in this One Instance, in investigating a Charge against any of its Schoolmasters?

Not at that Time; but I was subsequently.

Has it often happened to you to investigate Charges under the Direction of the Board?

Not often.

Has it several Times?

I can bring to my Recollection One Occasion subsequent to that.

Do you recollect its having occurred more than once?

I do not recollect its having occurred more than once, and that subsequent Case also referred to Achill.

Then are the Committee to understand that the only Case in which you have been employed to investigate Complaints against Schoolmasters has been in the Island of Achill?

I do not recollect any particular Instance at this Moment; there may have been some other trifling Charges.

Then the Committee are to understand that you, being the Inspector of the Board, do not recollect whether you ever have been instructed by the Board to inquire into the Conduct of any Schoolmaster against whom Complaint has been made, except in this Instance of O'Donnell at Achill?

Yes; there was a Man of the Name of Cassidy in the same Island.

But, with the Exception of those Two Instances in the Isle of Achill, do you say that you do not recollect ever to have been employed in investigating any Charge against a Schoolmaster?

I cannot at this Moment bring to my Mind any.

How long have you been Inspector?

Since the Year 1833. I recollect perfectly now another Case; a Case of a Man of the Name of Flaherty, in the County of Galway.

But with that Exception you do not recollect any other Case?

So far as I recollect at this Moment I do not recollect any other Instance.

Did the Board tell you that O'Donnell's going out with Green Boughs to meet Dr. M'Hale was the Complaint against him upon that Occasion?

I cannot positively state, but I should say it was so from the view I took of the Thing.

Can you recollect whether the Board told you that the Complaint against O'Donnell was for heading a Procession, carrying Flags and Banners, which went to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Arrival at this Place, and that he bore a Flag with the Inscription "Welcome Religion and Liberty"?

I cannot recollect unless I have the Letter itself.

Have not you the Letter in your Possession?

I unfortunately did not bring it.

Did not you know that you were summoned here upon this Case?

I did.

Did not it occur to you that such a Letter as that would be very important?

It did not; I thought my own Report would be the principal Subject of Inquiry.

Mr. James Kelly.

You can procure that Letter?
I can.

Are the Committee to understand that you wrote your Report with the Secretary's Letter before you, and that you followed the Order of the Letter with respect to the Things you were to inquire into?
I cannot positively say; I should think I did from the Manner in which I made the Report.

When you were asked about the Letter just now, you referred to a Paper in your Hand, and you said you could infer from that Paper what the Statements were in the Letter?
Yes; I think I followed the Directions of the Letter.

Then if you think you followed the Directions of the Letter, do you think that you followed them when you made that Report of O'Donnell having admitted that he met Dr. M'Hale with Green Boughs, &c. Do you think that that must have been in accordance with the Instructions that were sent to you?
If your Lordships will allow me I will endeavour to procure that Letter before I can answer that Question with Certainty.

[Some Letters are shown to the Witness.]

Will you look at those Papers and see whether you find among them the Letter sent to you by Mr. Kelly?
Yes, here is the Letter.

Will you read it?
"Many Circumstances have occurred which render your immediate Visit to the National Schools of the Island of Achill absolutely imperative. Complaints have been forwarded of the Master of Dugort School by the Rev. Mr. Nangle of that Island upon Two several Occasions. Upon the latter Occasion this Gentleman accuses O'Donnell of threatening with a Knife to cut off the Head of any Child that would go to Mr. Nangle's School. I have written to the Reverend Mr. Connolly with respect to these Complaints, but the Board are of Opinion that your personal Visit, and your Explanation of the Principles of their National System, will be productive of much good. I have to remind you that these Schools have never yet had the Benefit of an Inspection, although aided by the Board; there is therefore every thing for you to do. I am also to remind you that Sectarianism as well as Political Animosity rage very much in those Islands. You will therefore so conduct yourself that in asserting the Principles of National Education, and setting Opinions right concerning it, you steer clear of giving Offence to any Side. I shall expect your Report in the Beginning of the ensuing Week."

That was the Letter which you considered your Instructions for going to Achill?
Yes.

That was the only Letter of Instructions you received?
I think there was one upon the 18th, after the one I have read.

Do you mean to say that you believe that the Second Letter gave you Instructions respecting the Two first Complaints?
I rather think it did.

Now have the goodness to look again at No. 23. of these printed Papers; there you say that the first Complaint is, that he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island met Dr. M'Hale with Green Boughs; but you see the Complaint in Mr. Nangle's Letter is about Flags and Banners. Do you mean to say that you received no Instructions from the Board to inquire into a Complaint about his carrying Flags and Banners?
I cannot say without I see the Letter; I am positive there is such a Letter giving me Instructions to inquire about Green Boughs, or about Flags and Banners.

You see that you have answered as if the Complaint was of Green Boughs; now you are referred to the Letter of Mr. Nangle to the Board, where it appears that his Complaint says nothing about Green Boughs, but Flags and Banners?
If I fell into such an Error it must have been an Error of my own; if the Letter stated that I was to make an Inquiry as to his carrying Flags, and I made an Inquiry as to Green Boughs, the Error must have been my own.

Do you know for certain what your Instructions were?
I cannot say positively till I see that Letter.

What Reason have you to believe that you received a further Letter of Instructions, dated the 18th of October?
Upon looking at this Paper again I perceived that I was making an Error as to the Date of the 18th.

Have you any Reason to know that you received a Letter dated the 18th of October 1835?
No, I had not.

Do you believe that you received such a Letter?
No.

Then, not believing that you received a Letter of the 18th, is the Letter of the 17th, which you have read, the Letter which you call your Instructions in your Report of the 24th of October, and upon which you made your Report?
I would be inclined to believe that the Charges were more fully stated in a Letter subsequent to the 17th, from the Manner in which I have made the Report.

You had no verbal Communication upon the Subject?
None whatever; I was in a distant Part of Ireland at the Time.

Do you still doubt whether you had a subsequent Communication?
I almost think I had a subsequent Letter.

Were any Instructions enclosed in that Letter?
I should say not.

Had you got any Charges from Mr. Nangle before you visited the School?
The Matter is so long since that I cannot well remember.

You will observe this is dated the 24th of October 1835, and the Committee are now sitting on the 21st of April 1837, about a Year and a Half, and this Inquiry went on from Month to Month?
The second Inquiry did not take place till July 1836.

Are you a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?
I am a Roman Catholic.

Are you from that Part of Ireland?
No; I was born in Dublin.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 24° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Mr. JAMES KELLY is called in, and further examined as follows:

Do you wish to give any Explanation with reference to your former Evidence?

With your Lordships Permission I wish to explain an Error I fell into on the last Day of Examination, and the Cause of it. In the course of my Examination on Friday, seeing my Report, and finding I had investigated Charges not contained in the Secretary's Letter to me of the 17th of October 1835, I could not at this Distance of Time recollect how I received those Charges, and I fell into the Error of supposing I had received a Second Letter from the Secretary on the Subject of those Charges. On Reflection I, however, perfectly recollect that I did not receive a Second Letter. The First and Second Charges against O'Donnell reported on I had from Mr. Connolly. On my telling him I came to investigate Charges against O'Donnell, he answered, "What is the Use of investigating Charges which he admits?" I then asked what Charges he admitted, and Mr. Connolly gave me the Two first Charges contained in my Report. The Third Charge is the only one contained in the Secretary's Letter to me, and I investigated it in the Presence of Mr. Nangle. The Fourth Charge I received from Mr. Nangle, although not mentioned in my Instructions from the Board.

Are the Committee to understand that you received no Instructions from the Board as to the Charges you were to investigate against O'Donnell on the 24th of October, except the Letter of the 17th of October?

That was the only Instruction.

Did you ever receive, in any Form, Instructions from the Board to investigate the Charges contained in No. 3. of the printed Papers?

Not in any Form. I had no further Directions, except such as were contained in the Letter of the 17th of October.

Did you obtain any Knowledge of the Charges against O'Donnell from any other Quarter but from Mr. Connolly?

From Mr. Connolly and from Mr. Nangle, and the One Charge contained in the Letter of the 17th of October.

Any other Charges you investigated you merely investigated upon the Information and Complaint of Mr. Nangle himself?

Yes.

Why did you go to Mr. Connolly for the Charges that you were to investigate on the Complaint of Mr. Nangle?

I did not go to him exactly for those Charges; but, as well as I can recollect the Conversation at this Period, I said to him, "I have come to investigate Charges against O'Donnell." "Oh," said he, "what is the Use of investigating Charges that he admits?" "What Charges does he admit?" said I. This was the Substance of the Conversation. Said he, "He admits that he went out to meet Dr. M'Hale with Green Boughs." I noted that; and I said, "What other Charges?" Then said he, "He admits having controversial Discussions with Mr. Nangle's Readers and Preachers." Those were the Two that Mr. Connolly gave me.

Then from Mr. Connolly you went to Mr. Nangle?

I went to the School in order to inspect the School.

Mr. James Kelly.

Not to pursue the Investigation, but to inspect the School?
Yes.

Was the Master there?
He was.

Did you tell him the Charges brought against him?
I think I mentioned the One Charge to him, contained in the Letter of the 17th.

And that only?
As well as I can recollect, that only.

What was that?
The Third Charge, as to threatening to cut off the Head of a Child that went to Mr. Nangle's School.

With regard then to the other Two Charges, you took your Report of those Charges from Mr. Connolly; you said nothing of them to the Schoolmaster?
I think not.

When you went to Mr. Nangle, what passed between you and him on the Subject of those Two first Charges?
I told him that it was admitted that O'Donnell had mixed in this Procession to meet Dr. M'Hale with Green Boughs; as I remember distinctly the Words were "Green Boughs."

What made you so particularly fix upon "Green Boughs"?
Because I took a Note of it at the Moment, and I knew of nothing else. I did not know any thing of Flags.

Did Mr. Nangle tell you of the Flag with the Inscription upon it?
I should say not. I think it was more a Matter of Conversation than of Investigation; because I thought that the Charge was the same as the Admission of Green Boughs. I knew nothing of a Flag.

But you knew nothing of the Charge till Mr. Connolly told you?
No.

Did you mention to Mr. Nangle simply that he admitted the Charge?
That he admitted the Charge of having gone out to meet Dr. M'Hale with Boughs.

You used the Word "Boughs"?
I am not certain that I did, but I rather think I did.

This Island does not abound in Trees, does it?
No, it does not.

Did you see a single Tree in the Island that was capable of affording Green Boughs?
I cannot bring to my Recollection; I know there are very few.

Do you recollect that the Island is so bare of every thing like Trees that there is nothing higher in it than a mere Osier?
There are very few Trees in it, certainly, if any; I do not recollect any at this Moment.

Do you recollect being struck by the Island being thoroughly bare of Trees?
I cannot say thoroughly bare.

Do you think that there is on the Island a single Thing higher than a mere Osier?
I cannot say.

Are there many Osiers in Achill?
I should say there are few.

Would they answer the Purpose; and would they be called "Green Boughs," if they were carried in a Procession
I should say so; or the Underwood of the Island.

There

461

Mr. James Kelly.

There was Underwood, was there?
There was Copse.

There was Copse, was there?
A Kind of Heather.

What did you tell Mr. Nangle of the Second Charge?
I told him that O'Donnell admitted having had controversial Discussions.

And you are sure that that was all that you told Mr. Nangle; that he admitted having controversial Discussions?
That was all.

Did Mr. Nangle, or did he not, say that his Charge against O'Donnell was not for holding controversial Discussions, but for being a zealous Agent in enforcing the Commands of Dr. M'Hale given to the People of the Island, that they were to hold no Communication with the Members of the Protestant Church?
I am almost positive that he made no such Statement.

With respect to the Third Charge; do you recollect going with Mr. Nangle to M'Ginty, and seeing him and his Child?
I do.

Do you recollect that after you had seen him you made any Remark to Mr. Nangle?
I do not recollect any particular Remark.

You do not recollect saying, "This is quite satisfactory," or Words to that Effect?
I do not recollect whether I might have said that.

Is it possible that you could have said, "This is quite satisfactory, and I shall report to the Board"?
I might have said that I would report the Evidence that was given in support of the Charge.

Might you have said, "This is quite satisfactory"?
I cannot at this Distance of Time say.

Will you look at your Report and see what you have said respecting it?
"The Third Charge states that O'Donnell threatened 'to cut off the Head of a Child going to Mr. Nangle's School, if he persisted in so doing.' I examined the Child so threatened. Michael M'Ginty, Nine Years of Age, declares, that going one Day to Mr. Nangle's School he met O'Donnell, who threatened to cut off his Head if he went there any more. Andrew M'Ginty, Father to the Child, states that he returned home, and told him the Conduct of O'Donnell."

Now will you read what you say upon that?
"The Evidence of the Parties on the Third I should be inclined to receive with much Caution, as I am sure that slight Inducements would be sufficient to cause the People of this Island, where party and political Feeling rages to such an Extent to deviate from the Truth."

Now, is it possible that if you thought that was the Report to be made, you could have said to Mr. Nangle, "This is quite satisfactory, and I shall report to the Board"?
I cannot answer that Question.

Then will you read the Fourth Charge?
"That O'Donnell sent a Message by one of his Scholars to his Sister, declaring, that if she went to Mr. Nangle's Night School he would be before her, and thereby endeavour to prevent her so doing."

Will you read what you have said upon that?
"This Charge has not been sustained; as, on my questioning Edward Mangan or Lavelle, he declared that O'Donnell did not say so, but that he told her from himself, in order to deter her from attending Mr. Nangle's School."

Mr. James Kelly.

Who declared that?
The Brother; the Boy that conveyed the Message.

Do you recollect a Woman coming out of the House while you were questioning Mangan or Lavelle upon that Subject?
I do.

Did she speak in English any thing, or in Irish?
I think in Irish.

Was what she said translated to you?
I think not.

Will you recollect; because it has been positively declared that it was?
I do not recollect what the Woman said. I know that she spoke in Irish; and if it was translated I do not recollect what it was.

Do you recollect that a Countryman was by at the Time?
Yes; I think there was a Man came with Mr. Nangle.

Do you recollect Mr. Nangle telling that Man to translate to you what had passed?
I do not.

Do you or do you not recollect this being translated to you, as said at this Time by the Woman: "We do not wish that my Sister should go to that School at all; for," said she, "is not the Parish Priest cursing her every Sunday in the Chapel for doing so; do not the People of the Village say they will come and cut her up in Quarters, and pull down the House over her Head?"
I do not recollect. I know that she spoke in Irish; and I do not recollect whether it was translated or not. I speak as to my Recollection.

Did you hear any thing upon that Occasion about Persons being cut up?
I do not remember.

Should not you have recollected if you had heard any thing so violent and so atrocious suggested?
I dare say I should.

But you do not recollect?
I do not recollect it.

If it had been said to you would it have induced you to inquire further into the Circumstance than you appear to have done, resting upon the Testimony of the Brother of the Person?
I was told that the Brother and Sister were the only Persons; they were the only Persons that Mr. Nangle brought forward to prove the Charge.

If you had heard that which has been read stated to you at the Time, would not it have induced you to make further Inquiries, and to refrain from taking for granted the Assertion of the Brother?
I do not see how I can answer that.

If you had heard such strong Expressions used, which you do not recollect to have heard, would you not have made further Inquiries, in consequence, as to this Charge?
I had no Opportunity of making any further Inquiry. If I had had an Opportunity of making further Inquiry I think I should.

Would not it have led you to believe that this was some Ground for the Charge, if that Woman had made such a Declaration as stated in the Evidence which has been read?
No; I think there was no Proof of the Charge.

You said that you were told that Mr. Nangle had only Two Witnesses; who told you so?
He was the only Person that could have told me. My Reason for saying that was, because they were the only Two Persons he produced to prove the Charge.

Were you told by Mr. Nangle that they were the only Two Persons?
He did not precisely say those are the only Two Persons I have to prove the Charge, but he did not tell me of any others.

Mr. James Kelly.

That is your Explanation of it, that you were not told of any others, and therefore you conceived they were the only Two Witnesses?
Yes.

In the same Report, in the last Paragraph but Four, you say that "the Teacher placed at the Dugort School by Mr. Connolly previous to the School being recognized by the Board or O'Donnell appointed was tampered with and finally brought over to Mr. Nangle's Side of the Question." What do you mean by "tampered with"?
I refer to the Statement made by Mr. Connolly to me, that the Person who taught before O'Donnell in the Dugort School left that School and went to Mr. Nangle's Colony. When I say "tampered with" I mean that Mr. Nangle influenced him to go.

What Sort of Influence did you mean to imply in "tampered with"?
I understood from Mr. Connolly that he held out Prospects to him; that he had been seduced.

What was his Name?
I do not know what his Name was.

You perceive that you write very decidedly that the Teacher was tampered with and finally brought over. Before you wrote that to the Board, on having been informed by Mr. Connolly that this Person had been so seduced by Mr. Nangle, did you mention to Mr. Nangle what had been said by Mr. Connolly?
No; it was after I left Mr. Nangle that Mr. Connolly told me of this. As well as I recollect, the Way in which this happened was this: I was saying to Mr. Connolly, "There appears to be a great deal of bad Feeling between Mr. Nangle and O'Donnell; now do not you think," said I, "if you were to remove him to some other School where he would have equal Emolument, that perhaps it might do away with this Feeling, and place some one else there?" He said to me, "I cannot do so, for those Reasons that I have stated."

And you thought yourself justified in stating thus peremptorily to the Board that such was the Fact, on the Statement to you of Mr. Connolly the Priest, though you had not an Opportunity of telling Mr. Nangle what was said?
I had no Reason to doubt Mr. Connolly.

Look at the same Paragraph, and you will see that you state that Attempts had been made upon O'Donnell; what Attempts did you refer to?
Mr. Connolly also stated that Attempts were made to induce O'Donnell to pursue the Course adopted by his Predecessor.

What Attempts?
I cannot immediately recollect.

Did you understand any improper Attempts?
I cannot recollect just now what the Attempts were.

Did you tell Mr. Nangle this either?
No.

Having had this only from Mr. Connolly, and not having told Mr. Nangle of this, did you consider yourself justified in reporting thus formally to the Board, on this Investigation of yours, that those Complaints had been lodged against O'Donnell, not, you were sure, so much with a view to the general Good as to injure him?
I thought so from the general Tenor of the Investigation,—from the Manner in which the Charges were sustained against O'Donnell.

You are understood to state that the Attempts were not described to you by Mr. Connolly?
I think they were at that Time.

You stated that you did not recollect what was described?
I do not recollect what was described.

Had you any Communication upon the Subject but with Mr. Nangle and Mr. Connolly?
Nobody but those Two, and the Witnesses.

Mr. James Kelly.

Were there any Witnesses produced as to any Attempts to seduce or tamper with O'Donnell?
No, none.

Then all the Information you got was from Mr. Connolly?
On that Point.

You do not recollect what that Information was?
I do not distinctly recollect.

Do you recollect whether it was more than general to that Effect, or whether he gave you any Proof of it at the Time?
I cannot bring it to my Recollection.

You do not recollect whether or not you took that Accusation merely upon the Information of Mr. Connolly the Priest?
I took it solely from him.

And you did not state any thing upon that Subject to Mr. Nangle?
No; it was subsequent to my Interview with Mr. Nangle.

Do you mean that you only saw Mr. Nangle once during the Time you were there?
I saw him subsequently in the following Year; but this Time I saw him only once.

Then you made that positive Report without ever having communicated with Mr. Nangle upon the Subject of it, or endeavoured to ascertain whether the general Statements made to you were true or false?
I took it on Mr. Connolly's own showing.

Did you think any other Testimony necessary than Mr. Connolly's as to the Fact of his Motive for wishing to retain O'Donnell as Schoolmaster?
I did not think any other Testimony required.

You went to Mr. Connolly in the first instance on arriving in the Island?
I did; I had to pass by his House.

Do you suppose that any other Person's Authority could have given any Strength to Mr. Connolly's Testimony as to his own Motive, as far as that was Part of your Assertion for what he had done in appointing and retaining O'Donnell?
No, I should think not.

Do you think that in an Investigation of a Charge it is your Duty to hear one Side only, or both?
This was not a Charge against the Teacher. Upon a Charge against a Teacher I should think it was my Duty to investigate both Sides.

But in a Charge against a Person that complained of a Teacher you did not think it your Duty to hear both Sides?
I did not think I was perhaps authorized in inquiring into the Thing.

Did you think yourself authorized to report upon this, though you did not think yourself authorized to inquire into it?
I did report, because I wished to give a Reason to the Board for Mr. Connolly's retaining him.

Did you consider Mr. Connolly as meaning to prefer a Charge against Mr. Nangle in having tampered with the Schoolmaster, when he stated these Facts to you, or did you consider him as merely accounting to you for his Desire to retain O'Donnell as Schoolmaster?
Merely wishing to account to me for his Desire to retain O'Donnell.

Then, in fact, you made that as the best Report that, in your Judgment, you could come to upon the Facts, from your Investigation?
Yes. I wish to explain a Conversation that I had with Mr. Connolly; although I did not put the Conversation in my Report, still this bore upon it.

Did you know any thing of Mr. Connolly before?
Yes, I did.

Mr. James Kelly.

Had you known him long?
I was at the School where he was educated.

Were you at School with him?
I cannot say I was at School with him; he was in the Ecclesiastical School, and I was in the Lay School, of Tuam.

You are a Relation of the late Dr. Kelly of Tuam?
I am his Nephew.

When were you appointed Inspector?
In the Year 1833.

That was before your Uncle's Death, was it?
It was.

On whose Recommendation were you appointed?
I had numerous Recommendations.

Do you recollect any in particular? Your Uncle very naturally would recommend you; do you recollect that he was one?
I do not, indeed; I do not think that he was one. I recollect a Recommendation from a Relation of mine, a Protestant Clergyman, Mr. Ashe.

Are you related to Mr. Kelly the Secretary of the Board?
No Relation whatever.

Did Mr. Nangle state to you, on the Occasion of this Investigation, that O'Donnell had been dismissed from the Coast-guard for making seditious Speeches?
On this Occasion I do not think that Mr. Nangle made that Charge.

Were you aware at that Time that Mr. Nangle had made that Charge?
I was not.

You are confident of that?
I am.

In the Report No. 24. of the printed Papers you state a Circumstance as exemplifying the distracted State of the Island; will you read that Passage?
"As Mr. Connolly (who accompanied me to all the Schools) and I proceeded, on Tuesday last, from Keel to Dugort on Foot, not having been able to procure Horses, we met Two of Mr. Nangle's Bible Readers, who followed us a Distance of a Mile and a Half, discussing in our hearing various controverted Subjects, such as would be likely to exasperate and wound his Feelings, but of which he took no notice; they managed their Distance so well, that, no matter at what Pace we walked, we could not lose One Word of their Conversation."

When you say you met them, what do you mean? Were you and Mr. Connolly going on the Road in one Direction, and did you meet these Two Bible Readers coming a contrary Direction?
We were coming from Keel to Dugort, and there was one of them sitting on a Stone by the Roadside, and the other, I think, was standing in the Road; they were speaking to a Peasant who was digging, and they had Books in their Hands, which I believe were Bibles.

You mean that you saw them; you do not mean that you met them on the Road, and that they turned about and followed you?
One of them was sitting and the other standing at the Time.

And you did not see in which Direction they were going?
No. I know the Direction they took afterwards.

You have said there was a Third Person near them, and that they had Books; were they or were they not conversing with that Person on Religious Subjects?
They were conversing with him; I do not know upon what Subject.

When they were conversing with Books in their Hand, did not Mr. Connolly interrupt their Conversation with this Man, and reprove him, as being one of his Congregation, for conversing with them?
On coming up Mr. Connolly stopped and called the Man to him; I walked on

Mr. James Kelly.

and passed them all by, and waited for him down a little further on the Road; I did not hear what Mr. Connolly said.

Did Mr. Connolly tell you what he had said?
I think not.

Did any thing pass to induce you to understand that Mr. Connolly reproved this Man for talking with these Persons, and to prevent them from going on?
I cannot bring any thing to my Recollection.

Did this Man walk away with you and Mr. Connolly?
No.

You are sure that he staid there?
I am not positive that he staid there; he did not come with us.

You do not know but that it might have happened that Mr. Connolly might have rebuked the Man for talking with them, and that in consequence of that Interruption they then followed, making those controversial Observations?
I cannot say indeed.

In point of fact Mr. Connolly did go and speak to that Man with whom they were talking at the Time?
He did.

But you do not know what he was talking about?
I cannot say what he was talking about; I did not hear him.

And you have no reason whatever to suppose that he was rebuking him for thus talking with them?
I could not swear as to that.

You had no Knowledge of that?
I had no Knowledge of it.

Looking again at what you have stated in your Report, do you think that that Representation is that Sort of Representation which, when these Things are brought to your Recollection, you would state to be an adequate and just Statement?
I do think it a just Statement.

You will see what that Statement is:—"We met Two of Mr. Nangle's Bible Readers, who followed us a Distance of a Mile and a Half, discussing in our hearing various controverted Subjects." You think that is a fair Way of stating this, although there was this Incident occurred of Mr. Connolly's going up and talking with the Man with whom they were conversing, which, for aught you know, might have caused that Proceeding on their Part?
I think it a fair Statement, if I may be allowed to give an Explanation of the Word "met"; what I meant by met is, that we came up to them where they were standing.

Was it the Fact that they did follow you for a Mile and a Half?
It was the Fact.

And that they talked upon those Subjects in such a Way as that you could hear them?
Yes.

Do you recollect any Part of the Conversation?
The only Word that I can recollect now is, that One of them was speaking of the Man of Sin.

Applying that to Mr. Connolly?
I took it so, and I was uneasy lest any thing unpleasant might occur; and I said to Mr. Connolly, "Do not mind, do not take any notice of what these Persons say." We varied our Pace very much, and walked behind and walked on, and still we could not get rid of them till they came to the Entrance of the Settlement.

You mean, that when you varied your Pace they varied theirs, so as to keep within Hearing Distance of you?
Exactly so.

Before

Mr. James Kelly.

Before you came up to them, or after Mr. Connolly joined you again, did he say any thing to you which induced you to suppose that he had been remonstrating with that Man? Did he express any Indignation that these People had been talking to a Man of his Congregation?

I can only speak from my Recollection of the Matter; I think he said, "You see now the Means these People resort to."

Did that apply to the Conversation they were holding with that Man, or to their irritating Language towards you and Mr. Connolly?

No; to the Conversation they were holding with this Man.

Did you conceive, when you heard those Persons say the Man of Sin, that it applied personally to Mr. Connolly?

I did.

Why did you so suppose?

I supposed it from my Recollection, although I cannot now say the Grounds upon which I supposed it.

Did you or Mr. Connolly request of these Men to walk on and leave you?

No; we had no Conversation whatever with them.

Then you did not give them in any Manner to understand that it was disagreeable to you and Mr. Connolly that they should accompany you so close?

Except by altering our Pace and remaining behind, upon which they altered theirs accordingly, and then getting on very rapidly. I recollect I was very anxious to be rid of them; I was afraid lest any thing unpleasant, lest any Altercation, would take place between them, and I did not wish to be a Party to it.

You knew Mr. Connolly when he was at School?

I did.

Intimately?

I was not at all so intimate with him as I was with the Boarders on my own Side of the House.

Did you keep up your Acquaintance with him from that Time to this?

No. I was at that School about Twelve or Eighteen Months; that is Twelve Years ago, and I have not seen him between.

You stated that those Men followed you according to the Rate at which you and Mr. Connolly went; as you did hear the Words "Man of Sin," do you mean to say that you did not hear the rest of the Conversation?

I could hear detached Parts of it. I recollect they used to open various Parts of the Bible, which Book I believe was the one they had, and repeat Texts from it, and appeal to each other if that did not upset such and such Doctrines. Although I cannot recollect any particular Text, still I recollect perfectly the Substance of it.

That was the general Tenor of the Conversation?

Yes.

Would not those Words, "Man of Sin," have reference to something they were talking of, not to Mr. Connolly?

My Impression was that they had reference solely to him.

Do you know the Persons of those Two Individuals?

I do not think I would recollect them.

You did not observe them close enough to know them?

At that Time I did; I had a full Opportunity of observing them; but I do not think at this distant Period I should recollect them.

Do you think you could identify them now?

No; I would not wish to do so from my Recollection.

Will you look at No. 7. in Pages 6 and 7. Does that Letter purport to be the Decision of the Board, communicated by the Secretary to Mr. Nangle, on the Matters which had been entrusted to your Investigation?

Yes; but there is a slight Confusion there.

Mr. James Kelly.

Will you read the Second Paragraph?

"They find that this Charge is supported by the Evidence of the Accuser only, Michael M'Ginty, a Child of Nine Years of Age, the elder M'Ginty being merely a Narrator of what this Child had told him. On the other Side they find that there is the most direct Proof, not only that O'Donnell did not use the Words alleged in the Charge at all, but that it was another Person who used them."

Now, have the goodness to turn to your Report, No. 22. Does that Decision of the Board appear to you at all to be in accordance with your Report?

It is in accordance with my Report, except that it confuses Two Charges. From reading this you would suppose that it had reference to but One Charge, whereas my Report refers to Two distinct Charges.

Do you mean to say that that Decision accords with your Report, except that the Decision confounds the Two Charges together, which are taken separately in your Report?

That is what I mean.

Are the Committee right in understanding that the Board applies the Evidence of the Fourth Charge to the Third Charge?

I would suppose so; it seems to be confused here; but I cannot say whether they do so or not.

But in point of fact, taking the Words of the Decision as they stand, will you say whether they do or do not apply the Evidence of the Fourth Charge to the Third Charge?

I think the Secretary would best answer that Question as to what they meant.

You stated on a former Day, that in another Case of Complaint you had been sent as the Inspector. Did you on that Occasion receive any detailed Instructions?

I did.

Have you got those detailed Instructions?

I have.

Will you produce them?

[The Witness produces a Paper.]

This relates to Mr. Nangle; but there was another Charge which you stated you were sent to investigate?

I have not got those Papers here.

Did you receive Instructions upon that Case in Writing?

I did.

Have you got those Instructions?

I have got those Instructions. I think I have them with me.

What Case do they refer to?

The Case of the Dismissal of a Teacher at Roundstone in the County of Galway.

Have you ever been sent as Inspector to inquire into any other Cases?

There is another Case in Achill with reference to another Teacher.

Are those the only Two Cases in which you have been employed as Inspector?

As Inspector in Cases of Complaint against Teachers.

What are your usual Duties as Inspector?

I have a regular Form of Report to make on all the Schools in the District that I am appointed to.

What Extent of District does your Inspection go over?

Four Counties.

Are you by your Office bound to visit the Schools frequently?

As often as I can; as often as the Extent of my Duty will allow.

How

Mr. James Kelly.

How often has that been?
Once yearly; or, in particular Cases, I may be sent a Second Time, or perhaps a Third Time, to some Place.

Are there many of those particular Cases in which you have been sent a Second or a Third Time?
No, very few. I had this Case of Achill particularly in my Mind when I made the Answer.

Are there any other Cases in which you have been sent twice?
I do not recollect any other.

What specific Inspection do you go through when you arrive at a School?
I examine the Returns and Rolls and Books in the School, and examine the Accounts and see the different Classes, and observe the Method adopted by the Teachers; I suggest any Improvements that I think advisable, and also report on the State of the Schoolhouse, and so on.

Do you keep any Minutes of your Proceedings?
I always take Notes.

Are you in possession of those Notes?
I am.

Can you produce them?
I can. I doubt if they would be very intelligible to your Lordships.

The Notes you make are for your own Use only, and intended to be the Foundation of such Reports as you judge necessary?
Exactly so.

Have the Commissioners called upon you for any Notes which you took in explanation of your Report upon the Complaint of Mr. Nangle, or have you made any Extracts from those Notes for the Use of the Commissioners, or to justify the Purport of your Report?
I am not aware of their having called upon me for my Notes, unless this Letter of the 9th of June 1836 may be considered as such: "The Commissioners of Education request you will reply, by Return of Post, to the following Queries, viz^{t}: What passed between you and the Rev. Mr. Nangle? Did Mr. Nangle say that he could prove any Facts if Time were allowed to him to produce Witnesses, or did he say that he had any Witnesses, or did he complain that he had not Notice of the Inspector's Intention to visit the School?" Unless that might be considered as calling for Notes I am not aware of any.

Will you read your Answers to those Questions?
"At the Time of my Visit to Achill I fully investigated the Charges made against O'Donnell, the Teacher of the Dugort National School, and examined all the Witnesses concerned in those Charges, and reported to the Board the Result. Mr. Nangle regretted he did not know of my Intention of calling upon him, and stated that he would have had all the Persons connected with these Matters to meet me; I, however, met his Objections by telling him that I would accompany him to their several Houses. We accordingly went to the Places where these Persons were engaged at the Time. Mr. Nangle afterwards stated that had he had Notice of my Visit he would have had the Matter arranged. I could not judge on what Grounds he made this Assertion, as he did not say that any of his Witnesses were unproduced; on the contrary, I accompanied Mr. Nangle across the Island, a Distance of Three or Four Miles, in order to meet one of the Parties. From all those Circumstances I feel assured that all the Persons concerned in the Matter were before me. In my Report I stated fully to the Board the Substance of my Interview with Mr. Nangle, which was confined to the Matter before the Board."

How long was that Letter written after your Investigation?
On the 11th of June 1836; the Inquiry was in October 1835.

Did you refer to your Notes for the Purpose of writing that Letter?
I did, and to my Recollection of the Matter generally.

Mr. James Kelly.

But you were not called upon to produce any of your Notes by the Board?
No.

Are your Notes as intelligible to yourself at present as they were when the Transactions were fresh and vivid in your own Mind?
They are.

Are you directed by the Board to keep a Minute Book of your Proceedings?
No.

Is there not a Minute Book kept in all the Schools?
Not of the Inspectors Proceedings; the Inspectors make Entries in the Report Book of the School.

The Inspectors do not keep a Minute Book for the Purpose of satisfying the Board of the Execution of their Duties as Inspectors?
I should think not. I keep Notes of my own Duty for myself, and I report to the Board on every School I visit.

Have the Board in any Case called upon you to produce your Minutes in support of what you have stated in your Reports?
No; unless this Letter which I have just read may be considered to have reference to that Point.

You stated that you had Four Counties under your Care as Inspector; how many Schools are there in those Four Counties?
I cannot recollect; the Business is increasing every Day; I am obliged to report upon every new Applicant Case.

Are you occupied every Day?
Almost every Day.

Have you any other Profession?
It occupies my entire Time.

You have stated that you communicated with Mr. Nangle, and saw all the Witnesses that he produced on that Occasion?
I did.

You went across the Island with him?
I did.

He did not mention that you were to call for any Witnesses that were forthcoming?
He did not.

And you therefore heard all that he had to allege upon the Subject?
I understood that I did.

Have you any Doubt upon that Subject?
I have no Doubt.

And your Report was drawn in consequence of that?
Yes.

How long after you made the Examination did you draw up that Report?
I took Notes at the Time, and I believe it was the same Day or the following that I made the Report; I wished particularly to furnish the Board with the Report as soon as possible.

What District of Ireland is under your Charge now as Inspector?
Connaught. I have Four Counties.

What District were you in charge of in the Year 1835?
The same.

Were you sent to Achill in consequence of being nearer to it, or were you sent directly from Dublin?
I was on my Tour of Inspection.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows: *T. F. Kelly, Esq.*

Will you turn to No. 3. of the printed Correspondence now shown to you. Do you recollect at any Time giving Instructions to any Inspector to inquire into the Facts contained in that Letter of Mr. Nangle's?
No. I gave no Instructions to an Inspector to inquire into the Facts contained in this Letter.

Will you look at No. 4. and turn to the Top of Page 6. Is that a Letter in answer to No. 3?
It is.

Will you read the Third Line of that?
"The Transaction respecting O'Donnell, as alleged, they will have investigated; and also they will communicate with the Patrons of the School, so as to prevent either the happening of such a Transaction as you have mentioned or the Recurrence of it."

Was that intended as a Promise to Mr. Nangle that an Investigation should take place?
It was intended as a Promise, and an Investigation did take place in consequence of it.

When did it take place?
As immediately after my Letter of the 16th September, which I addressed to Mr. Connolly the Patron of the School upon the Subject, as was possible. This Investigation was made at this Time not through our Inspector, but by Letter, addressed, as I have stated, by me to Mr. Connolly immediately after the Receipt of Mr. Nangle's Letter, calling his Attention to so much of the Complaint as I stated; and to which I received a Reply from that Gentleman, dated the 20th September, acknowledging as Fact the Matter in respect of which I wrote, and promising future good Conduct upon the Part of the Teacher, whom he had admonished.

Then you mean to say that Mr. Nangle having made this Complaint to the Board, and you having given this Answer promising Investigation, you satisfied that Promise by making the Inquiry through Mr. Connolly, who was the Patron of the School, and not through the Inspector. Did you inform Mr. Nangle that you should make such an Inquiry through Mr. Connolly?
Not in those Terms. Your Lordships have before you, in my Letter of the 16th of September, the exact Words of my Promise to Mr. Nangle.

In point of fact you did not inform Mr. Nangle that the Investigation would be made, which afterwards was made, through Mr. Connolly?
In point of fact I did not.

Did Mr. Nangle ever receive from you any Intimation of the Result of that Investigation?
He did not.

Was that a solitary Instance, as far as your Recollection goes, of the Mode in which the Board conducts its Investigation of Complaints, or not?
I have upon my Recollection no other Instance of the Non-communication adverted to.

Are the Committee to understand that in this Case, in which very grave Charges had been made by Mr. Nangle against a Schoolmaster, the Board, having promised that there should be an Investigation, never told Mr. Nangle of the Result of that Investigation?
It is quite true that upon Mr. Nangle's first Complaint the Result of the Inquiry into it was not communicated to him. I beg to add, however, that in carrying on the Inquiry, through the Patrons of the School, I but followed the Course pursued in Two Cases of the same Nature which occurred but One or Two Weeks previous to this very Case, and which, with your Lordships Permission, I will name. A Report was received from our Inspector in August 1835, complaining of the Teachers of Two National Schools in the North having walked in an Orange Procession on the 13th of July, the Month preceding,

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

preceding, one of the Teachers also being the Standard Bearer. This Report I brought before the Board on the 20th of August. The Course the Commissioners directed me to pursue was simply this: to write to the Correspondent of those Two Schools, stating to him that such Conduct in the Teachers was in direct Violation of their Rules, and requiring an Explanation in respect of it. An Answer was received from the Correspondent admitting that the Complaint was true, but that the Teachers had acted through Ignorance, and promising future good Conduct. The Commissioners were satisfied with this Explanation, and there the Matter ended; the Teachers being admonished. These Two Cases I considered to be good Precedents when I received the Complaint from Mr. Nangle, which came so immediately after them. I therefore followed them in my Mode of treating his Complaint, and followed them, as I thought, safely; being satisfied that the joining the Procession with a Banner inscribed "Welcome Religion and Liberty," as stated in the Complaint by Mr. Nangle, was precisely the same Species of Offence as the joining the Orange Procession and carrying a Banner, as stated in the Complaint made by our Inspector. I therefore addressed the Correspondent of this School, who, like the Correspondent of the Two Schools alluded to, admitted the Fact as alleged to be true, but stated that the Men had acted through Ignorance of the Rule of the Board, and promising future good Conduct on the Part of the Teacher, as he had admonished him. There the Matter ended in reference to this, as it had done in reference to the Two former Cases to which I have alluded.

You conducted yourself in a Manner equally just to the Complainants in both Instances, or equally unjust; which do you consider?

According to whichever Term your Lordship may think it right to use, so did I conduct myself.

In the Case of the Orange Processions, did you inform the Parties who had complained of your having made any Inquiry?

The Party who had made the Complaint of the Orange Procession was our own Officer.

Then in that Case it was not in fact a Complaint made by another Individual, but the Information was brought to you by your own Officer?

I admit the Difference in that Point. I do not say that that Case bears out the present one in all the Minuteness of its Parts, but that it does so in Substance and in Principle.

It has been said in Evidence by one of the Commissioners that Opportunities are always afforded to Complainants to establish their Case in the Investigation. Must not this be considered as an Exception to the general Rule?

I cannot say that it ought. I will state why: The Charge to which my Letter to Mr. Connolly specially referred, in communicating to him the Complaints urged by Mr. Nangle in his Letter of the 8th of September, was the joining an illegal Procession. My Letter did not contemplate that which is in the latter Part of Mr. Nangle's Letter, namely, that O'Donnell had been implicated in Ribbonism. Reference to my Letter upon this Occasion to Mr. Connolly will show the View which I took of that Letter of the 8th of September of Mr. Nangle. Mr. Connolly's Reply being an Admission, as I have stated, of the Fact of O'Donnell having joined the Procession, I conceived there was no Case for further Investigation, this Admission rendering it unnecessary.

Do you mean to say that the only Complaint in that Letter against O'Donnell was for joining this Procession, and having been formerly implicated in Ribbonism?

There is some Language of a very objectionable Nature attributed to him.

Will you read it?

"Dr. M'Hale, before his Departure from the Island, thought fit to curse some of the Peasantry who had left the Church of Rome and joined themselves with us as Members of the Protestant Church. He forbade their Roman Catholic Neighbours to speak to them or hold any Intercourse with them in the way of Courtesy or Traffic. O'Donnell is a zealous Agent for enforcing these unsocial Commands. On Sunday last, seeing one of the Islanders conversing with one of our People, he reproved him for holding any Communication with

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

an accursed Heretic, asking him, was he not aware that he himself came under the Priest's Curse for so doing" ?

Does not that appear to you to be an additional and grave Charge ?
I think it an additional Charge, but I also think it a loose one from the Manner it is put.

The Question is, whether it is a grave Charge ?
It appears to be a grave Charge, but a loose one.

Then you understand it to be a grave Charge put loosely ?
I do. It is a grave Charge put loosely. It is a loose Way of charging a Man with a grave Offence upon the Hearsay of another.

Because it was a grave Charge put in a loose Way did you think you were at liberty to omit altogether the Investigation of it, though you had promised in your Answer to it that it should be investigated ?
I cannot say that I can give an Answer to that Question in the Affirmative. It appeared to me to be a grave Charge and a loose Charge. It is loose because it is a Charge upon the Hearsay of a Third Person of Words spoken to him. It would be a grave Charge if brought home to this Man by direct Evidence.

Have the goodness to see whether Mr. Nangle did not allude, in his Letter of the 9th of October, No. 5, to this of the 8th of September ?
I think he does.

Have the goodness to read what relates to this Part of his Complaint from the Commencement to the Word "Congregation" ?
" Sir. From the Reply which I received to my Letter of September 8th, complaining of the Conduct of James O'Donnell, Teacher of the Dugort National School, I did hope that he would either have been dismissed or reprimanded by the Board in such a Tone as would deter him from the Commission of similar Offences in future. I regret to say that these Expectations have not been realized. There has been a Repetition of the objectionable Behaviour complained of in my former Letter: I allude to his Attempt to enforce the Prohibition which the Parish Priest uttered against any Communication being held by his Flock with Members of my Congregation."

You see that there is a Renewal of the Charge, without saying that that is upon Hearsay, but implying that he was prepared to prove that ?
So I took it upon Receipt of the Letter now referred to, namely, the Letter of October, and so I still take it.

Was there any Investigation in consequence of the Charge so made ?
There was an Investigation in consequence.

When ?
By Mr. Kelly, as appears by his Report bearing Date 24th of October 1835.

Did you instruct Mr. Kelly to investigate this Complaint ?
I have already delivered in to your Lordships my Letter of Instructions, which I sent upon the Occasion of Mr. Nangle's Letter of October, to Mr. Kelly. It bears Date the 17th of October.

Did you at any Time give Instructions to Mr. Kelly the Inspector to investigate that Charge ?
Yes, I did give him such Instruction by my Letter of the 17th of October.

By whose Directions did you write the Letter of the 16th of September ?
I wrote it from no specific Order of the Board, but as I conceived under my general Instructions as Secretary. I have already stated that I conceived that I had a Precedent in the Two Cases of the Orange Processions.

Will you point out the Part of the Letter of the 17th of October 1835 which contains an Instruction to the Inspector to inquire into the Complaint of Letter No. 3, repeated in No. 5 ?
The Substance of my Instructions on these Points was, that " there had been Complaints forwarded of the Master of Dugort National School, upon Two several Occasions, by Mr. Nangle; and that upon the latter Occasion he had

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

stated certain Particulars." I thus referred to the Letters both of September and October, and in express Terms I directed the Inspector therefore to go to Achill, in order to investigate all Matters, and report.

But the Inspector says that he could find in your Letter no Instruction to him respecting this Complaint, and therefore he did not investigate it?

It is perfectly true that my Letter contains of the Charges put forward by Mr. Nangle upon those Two several Occasions but One of them specified in Terms, but it is equally true that my Letter states that Mr. Nangle had been an Accuser upon Two several Occasions; and my Instructions to Mr. Kelly are at large, to go to Achill and report upon all Matters, telling him at the same Time that he has every thing to do. Nor did Mr. Kelly mistake my Directions, for in his Report of the 24th of October he has given the Accusation and the Evidence and the Judgment upon Four distinct Charges, being all the Charges brought before him; so that Mr. Kelly not only could not have misconceived the Meaning of my Letter giving him these Instructions at large to inquire into all Complaints, but on the contrary he fully acted up to them, and up to my Expectation of what he would do when I wrote him that Letter.

Mr. Kelly the Inspector having stated to this Committee that in consequence of his not having received these Instructions, which you conceive your Letter gave, he did not inquire, except by going to Mr. Connolly, and that Mr. Connolly told him of these Things; and that Mr. Connolly's Report only having been before him, he took it from the Information of Mr. Connolly, without investigating the Thing as by Order of the Board. Will you state whether that is in your Estimation a fit Mode on the Part of the Board of securing Attention from their Inspector to Complaints made?

I certainly should not think it a fit Mode if the Facts really were as stated in the preliminary Part of the Question; but my own Recollection of the Facts being precisely the other Way I feel that full Justice was done. I know that Mr. Kelly went to Mr. Connolly and to Mr. Nangle; I know that he held as it were an open Court with each; that he held his Ears open to receive every Accusation as well as every Defence; and that having done so he then made his Report of the 24th?

How do you know that?

From Mr. Kelly's Report, and also from his Conversation in an Interview with me, it being my Custom to converse with all the Inspectors upon their returning to the Office in Dublin at the End of their Tour.

Will you point out in the written Report before you, No. 3, the Part which says that he was holding an open Court both with Mr. Connolly and with Mr. Nangle for the Investigation of those Charges?

The Expression, "Open Court," is descriptive. I did not say that I quote the Words "Open Court" from Mr. Kelly's Report. When I used the Phrase I meant that he gave each Party an Opportunity to offer Accusation or to offer Justification.

Will you point out in that Report the Part from which you come to that Conclusion?

I draw the Conclusion from the entire Report; I think the Facts are there stated in detail; and I also have had an Interview with Mr. Kelly, whom I consider as an Officer of Trust of the Board of Education, at which Interview the Subject Matter of that Report has been the Subject Matter of Conversation.

Did you have those Interviews with Mr. Kelly previous to drawing out this Third Report?

Yes. I also had a written Communication with Mr. Kelly previous to drawing out the Third Report, which produced a Reply from Mr. Kelly that is embodied in the Third Report, namely, Whether Mr. Kelly, upon visiting the Island upon that Occasion, had given Mr. Nangle fair and clear Notice?

Did Mr. Kelly, in his Interview with you and his verbal Report of these Circumstances to you, tell you that with regard to the Two first Charges he did not communicate with Mr. Nangle but only with Mr. Connolly?

He did.

But

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

But not previous to your making the Statement to the Lord Lieutenant that you had investigated the Circumstance?

No; for my Impression at that Time was that Mr. Kelly had had all the Parties concerned together; but he has since informed me that he had a Communication with Mr. Connolly separately upon Two of the Charges, and with Mr. Nangle separately upon the other Two of them.

Before you saw Mr. Kelly, and had this Conversation with him in which he told you that he had had this Statement from Mr. Connolly only respecting Two of the Charges, did you suppose that he had given Mr. Nangle an Opportunity of full Investigation of those Two first Charges?

Certainly I did; because he waited upon Mr. Nangle, and of course Mr. Nangle might have used that Opportunity for bringing forward all the Charges which it appears he did for Two of them.

Have you found subsequently that that Report was not made on the same full Investigation upon which you thought previously that it had been made?

No; I do not alter my Opinion; because those Two Charges are Charges which had been admitted to me, previous to this Investigation, by Mr. Connolly in his Reply to my Letter of September, when I addressed him in consequence of Mr. Nangle's first Letter upon the Subject.

Will you read the Report upon the Second Charge?

"He also admits having had controversial Discussions with Mr. Nangle's Readers or Preachers, but states that such were forced upon him by their meeting him on the Roads and entering into them before the People; and that under those Circumstances he did not think he violated Rule by such Discussions."

That you consider to have been the Second Charge made by Mr. Nangle?

I think Mr. Nangle's Letters had a strong Colouring of that Charge, as well in his Letter of the 8th of September as in the Letter of the 9th of October.

Will you look at No. 5, where you find the Words, "I allude to his Attempt to enforce the Prohibition which the Parish Priest uttered against any Communication being held with his Flock by Members of my Congregation." Do you think that is or is not the same Charge as the Second Charge in Letter No. 23?

In strictness of Language I should think it was not, but I think in Effect and Substance that the Charge which we have in the Letters of the 8th of September and of the 9th of October is the same as that admitted in this Report of Mr. Kelly's upon the 24th of October. I find Mr. Nangle in September stating that O'Donnell is a zealous Agent for enforcing those unsocial Commands. I find him in October stating that he is enforcing the Prohibition of the Parish Priest. I find an admitted Charge on the 24th of October that O'Donnell has had controversial Discussions. Now, it being my Opinion that the Language of those Letters of Mr. Nangle in September and October is very loose, and also that all these Charges and Admissions agree in Substance so far as that they refer to angry Discussions and unsocial Commands, and being aware that different Men will express themselves of the same Thing differently, I looked upon all these Charges as part and parcel of one unsocial and unchristian Feeling, and therefore as all referring to the one Matter.

You will bear in mind that you now know that the Report of the 24th of October, No. 23, in respect to the Second Charge, was made only upon a Communication with Mr. Connolly?

I will; but that I did not know at first.

You were understood to say that Mr. Kelly the Inspector had recently informed you so?

Yes. Mr. Kelly the Inspector told me that upon those Two first Charges he had Communication with Mr. Connolly, and he stated that they were admitted Charges; and I conceived that they were admitted Charges equally by Mr. Connolly's Letter to me, in answer to the Letter which I wrote to him in the first instance upon Receipt of the Letter of the 8th of September of Mr. Nangle, which, for the first Time, contained the Charges.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Had you any Reason to believe that Mr. Nangle would have considered Persons holding controversial Discussions with his Readers or his Preachers a Subject of Complaint?

I cannot say what Mr. Nangle would consider upon that Subject.

Mr. Nangle having complained as follows:—"Dr. M'Hale, before his Departure from the Island, thought fit to curse some of the Peasantry who had left the Church of Rome and joined themselves with us as Members of the Protestant Church. He forbade their Roman Catholic Neighbours to speak to them or hold any Intercourse with them in the way of Courtesy or Traffic. O'Donnell is a zealous Agent for enforcing these unsocial Commands." Mr. Nangle having made that Complaint on the 8th of September, and having again said, on the 9th of October, "There has been a Repetition of the objectionable Behaviour complained of in my former Letter. I allude to his Attempt to enforce the Prohibition which the Parish Priest uttered against any Communication being held by his Flock with Members of my Congregation." You think that they may be fairly considered, without minute Investigation, as answered by "having had controversial Discussions with Mr. Nangle's Readers or Preachers"?

I think so; I think the one grew out of the other. I looked upon those Charges but as somewhat loose Assertions.

You conceived that your Letter of Instructions to Mr. Kelly comprised all the Three Charges?

I did, because I stated at large that upon Two several Occasions Mr. Nangle had made Complaints.

You conceive that the Report of your Inspector was a satisfactory Report upon all the Three Charges?

Yes.

You supposed at that Time that he had inquired into those Charges from Mr. Nangle?

I did.

You have subsequently ascertained that he never did upon those Charges communicate with Mr. Nangle?

Upon Two of them only.

You say, however, that, with the Information you now possess, you still continue to be of opinion that all those Charges had been satisfactorily investigated by the Inspector?

I do; because those Two Charges upon which he did not communicate with Mr. Nangle were admitted by the accused Party; and when he did communicate with Mr. Nangle, Mr. Nangle had full Opportunity,—and he is an active and zealous Man, if I may judge from his Correspondence upon the Subject,—he had full the same Opportunity to enter upon those admitted Charges equally as upon other Charges, or to bring forward any Charges that were then proveable against O'Donnell.

If at the Time this Investigation took place you had been aware that he had not communicated with Mr. Nangle upon the Two first Charges, how should you have supposed that he could ascertain what those Charges were?

Of course the Inspector not communicating with Mr. Nangle he could not ascertain what the Charges were from Mr. Nangle; but, as I stated before, the Inspector saw Mr. Nangle, who, upon seeing him, advanced only Two Charges against O'Donnell. It was equally competent to him to have advanced Twenty-two Charges, and it would have been the Duty of the Inspector to have examined into the Twenty-two Charges as well as into the Two which were advanced. I conceive that the Report was the Result of a fair Investigation, because the accusing Party was called upon by the Inspector in order to make good his Charges. He was called in pursuance of my Letter of Instructions, which stated to the Inspector that upon Two several Occasions Mr. Nangle had complained of O'Donnell, and which directed him to go and investigate. Mr. Nangle then having been called upon by the Inspector under these Circumstances, if the Fault be to rest upon any one for not bringing forward Charges upon the Occasion, certainly it ought to rest upon Mr. Nangle, who

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

was the accusing Party, and whose Duty therefore it was. Such as he did put forward were inquired into and reported upon. It appears that there were Two which were not put forward by him. That is the Fault of Mr. Nangle, not of the Inspector; therefore I still hold that the Report is a fair one.

Then you think that Mr. Connolly would have given as satisfactory a Statement of these Charges to the Inspector, and that the Inspector would have received as clear an Understanding of these Charges from Mr. Connolly against the Schoolmaster, as he would have received from Mr. Nangle himself?

No, I do not. Had the Report been, that all the Charges were admitted by the Teacher, and had Mr. Nangle not been called upon by the Inspector at all, I think that Question would have much Point in it; but Mr. Kelly did call upon Mr. Nangle, and gave him every Opportunity of putting forward every Charge which he had against the Master, and he had an equal Opportunity of putting forward these admitted Charges as he had of the others which he did put forward; that he did not do so was not Mr. Kelly's Fault, but Mr. Nangle's.

With respect to No. 7, which was written upon the 9th of November 1835; by whose Direction was that Letter written?

By Direction of the Board. I think I gave in the Minute of the 5th of November, in consequence of which I wrote that Letter.

Will you read that Minute?

"Minute of the Board, dated 5th of November 1835. Read the Report of Mr. Kelly the Inspector upon the Teacher of Dugort National School, of the 24th Ult., and also a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Connolly dated the 25th Ult. upon the same Subject. Considered that the Replies contained in these to the Charges advanced by the Rev. Mr. Nangle against this Teacher are satisfactory."

Who were the Members of the Board at which that Minute was made?

Dr. Murray and Dr. Sadleir.

Will you take No. 7. into your Hand, and read the Second Paragraph of that Letter?

"They find that this Charge is supported by the Evidence of the Accuser only, Michael M'Ginty, a Child of Nine Years of Age, the elder M'Ginty being merely a Narrator of what this Child had told him. On the other Side they find that there is the most direct Proof not only that O'Donnell did not use the Words alleged in the Charge at all, but that it was another Person who used them. They cannot but place the utmost Reliance upon the Fidelity of the Report made to them upon this Case by their Inspector, and also upon the concurrent Testimony forwarded to them by the Patron of the School."

Will you turn to the Report of the Inspector, No. 23, and read what the Inspector says upon the Third Charge?

"I examined the Child so threatened; Michael M'Ginty, Nine Years of Age, declares that going one Day to Mr. Nangle's School he met O'Donnell, who threatened to cut off his Head if he went there any more. Andrew M'Ginty, Father of the Child, states that he returned home and told him the Conduct of O'Donnell."

Will you read what follows afterwards with respect to the Third Charge?

"The Evidence of the Parties on the Third I should be inclined to receive with much Caution, as I am sure that slight Inducements would be sufficient to cause the People of this Island, where party and political Feeling rages to such an Extent, to deviate from the Truth."

Is that the whole of what the Inspector has said of the Third Charge in this Report?

It is.

Have the goodness to look at No. 7. Will you say whether you find in the Report of the Inspector, No. 23, any thing like the Assertion that is here made in your Letter written by the Direction of the Board, namely, Dr. Murray and Dr. Sadleir, saying that "on the other Side they find that there is the most direct Proof not only that O'Donnell did not use the Words alleged in the Charge at all, but that it was another Person who used them"?

There is an evident Error here; it is perhaps a pardonable one. I mixed

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

up the Declaration of an Opinion upon the Third and Fourth Charges together, in place of giving the Opinion of the Board upon each of them separately. There is Part of Two Sentences, beginning with the Word "the" and ending at the End of the Second Sentence with the Word "them;" one Part is applicable strictly to the Third Charge, the other is not so, but is strictly applicable to the Fourth only.

You have said that this Letter was written by Direction of the Board, that Board consisting of Dr. Murray and Dr. Sadleir; did they direct you what you were to write?

I had already written the Minute. My Direction is to embody the Minute, which is their Mind, in my Letter.

That was the only Direction you received?

That was the only Direction I received. I embodied that Minute thus.

You intended to embody it; but in point of fact you have stated as Evidence applying to the Third Charge that which did apply to the Fourth?

And also that which did correctly apply to the Third Charge itself. The Error is not an Error of Omission. I have stated that as the Evidence to the Third Charge which is correctly the Evidence to the Third Charge, but I have also applied to the Third Charge that which was not Evidence to it, but which was Evidence to the Fourth only. I regret that Mr. Nangle did not draw my Attention to it; if he had done so immediately afterwards the Mistake would have been cleared up.

Will you look at Mr. Nangle's Answer, No. 8, and read what he says upon the Third Charge there?

"As to the Third, the Inspector himself acknowledged that it was proved 'quite to his Satisfaction,' and that he would make his Report to the Board accordingly."

Was not that complaining of the Decision that had been communicated to him by you in the Letter, No. 7?

The Business of my Office is too pressing to admit of Time for minute Criticism. I found that the Letter referred to was substantially a Reply to my Letter, which drew it forth. I did not take it and put it alongside my Letter to see how far it touched it or not, critically speaking. I saw from it that he was dissatisfied, and I left it.

When you receive Complaints of this Nature against Schoolmasters is it your invariable Custom, when you undertake to investigate them, to send your Inspector in the first instance to the Patron?

No, it is not our invariable Custom. Our Custom very frequently is this, to write to the Correspondent himself; and by that candid Manner of proceeding the Result is generally found to be a satisfactory one. Charges brought forward have been admitted in the Replies, and the Remedy applied at once, without provoking any unpleasant Feeling or losing our Inspector's Time, whose Business is more generally to investigate the Discipline and Conduct of the Schools than Complaints against the Teachers.

In this Case you had a Communication by Letter previously to your undertaking to investigate it?

Yes.

You considered those Charges as of a grave Nature?

I stated that the Charge to which my Attention was turned I thought both grave and loose.

The Third Charge; did you consider that of a grave Nature?

I considered that of so grave a Nature that I mentioned it in my Letter to Mr. Kelly; in fact I looked upon it as a Kind of overt Act, the rest appearing to be Allegations which I thought he would better understand by going to the Spot; but this being an overt Act I thought it required a specific Notice, and therefore it was the only Charge I mentioned to him by Name.

But you considered the Charges of such a Nature as to justify sending an Inspector to inquire into them?

Yes.

Did

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Did you give the Inspector any Directions as to what Mode he was to proceed in?

Upon this specific Business my whole Directions to the Inspector are contained in my Letter of the 17th of October; but in the Instructions those Officers receive upon the general Duties of their Office it has been again and again laid down, that in examining Complaints they are to examine all Sides and all Things which bear upon the Complaint; that they are not to mock Inquiry by making it an ex parte one. And such is the Understanding of each of those Officers, of whom there are Eight, that in going to make Inquiry they are to make Inquiry calling all Sides who have any thing to urge upon it before them.

As a Lawyer, do you conceive it to be a right and judicious Course of proceeding in an Investigation to go to the Party against whom the Accusation is made in the first instance, instead of calling the Person who makes the Accusation?

Certainly not; nor did Mr. Kelly do so. The Complaints were not against Mr. Connolly, but against O'Donnell.

Do you not consider that under all those Circumstances, and from the previous Correspondence, the Complaints against the Schoolmaster to a certain Degree involved the Patron of the School?

No; and I would strive to keep that Conclusion from fastening itself upon my Mind without very good and sufficient Reasons. I could only look upon it as a Conclusion.

But whether as a Conclusion or not, was not that Impression upon your Mind, or upon the Mind of the Board, when they directed that Investigation?

It was not.

You did not consider the Charges brought forward by Mr. Nangle as at all involving the Character of the Patron?

That would depend upon the Result of the Investigation.

Are you still of opinion that under such Circumstances the proper Course for your Inspector to take was to go in the first instance to the Patron of the School?

I think that was a decorous Course; but had he rested there I would have considered him as liable to Censure. He did not, however; he went also to Mr. Nangle. Finding, therefore, that he acted with due Regard to Decorum in going to the Patron, and to the Ends of Justice in going to the Accuser, and that each of them had thus full Opportunity of affirming or denying what the other denied or affirmed, I think he acted justly.

Did you understand from him that when he went to the Accuser he stated to him that he was ready to hear all the Complaints?

I did not understand it from him; but I should suppose he forgot his main Instruction if he did not do so.

You are aware that the first Two Charges are very slightly glanced at in your Letter of Instructions; should you not have thought it the Duty of the Inspector to have called upon Mr. Nangle to state what his Charges were, unless he could produce other Instructions stating what those Charges were?

I conceive that he substantially did so when he called upon Mr. Nangle; I think his Act of calling was an Invitation to that Gentleman to advance by Word of Mouth his Charges of all or every Kind.

Should you think he has acted in that Manner if in his only Interview with Mr. Nangle he thus stated to him: "The Two first Charges are already admitted"?

I think if he had stated to Mr. Nangle that the Two first Charges were already admitted that Mr. Nangle reasonably could expect nothing more; all he could expect at his Hands was a Conviction of the Man upon these Charges. Afterwards he could write to the Board pressing them to inflict a Punishment upon that Conviction.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Would not Mr. Nangle naturally have conceived that the Inspector had received full Instructions as to the Nature of all the Charges?

It was in the Power of Mr. Nangle himself to have put that Question to him. If he did not do so it lies at his own Door.

Was it not natural for Mr. Nangle to suppose that this Inspector had come well instructed as to the Nature of his Charges, and that it was unnecessary for him to repeat them, the Inspector himself having stated to him that the Two first Charges were admitted?

Mr. Nangle might have supposed that, but we find the Fact the other Way; we find that he did repeat the Charges to Mr. Kelly.

If he did repeat them, and got an Answer from the Inspector that the Two first Charges were admitted by the Party accused, would not that be considered sufficient, and would he not naturally infer that the Inspector had had full Information of the Nature of those Charges?

I think he might have naturally supposed that if the Inspector had told him "The Two first Charges are admitted;" but Mr. Kelly got no Instructions upon any Charge except One specific One, and the specified One was not One of those admitted, and therefore all that Mr. Kelly could have said upon going to Mr. Nangle was, "There are Two Charges that I have heard from Mr. Connolly, and which are admitted by O'Donnell to be true."

But if Mr. Kelly said no such Thing, but gave him to understand that the Two first Charges had been admitted, without giving him to understand that he had only received those Charges through Mr. Connolly, and not through the Board, should you not then consider that Mr. Nangle very naturally supposed that he had been made acquainted by Authority with the Nature of those Charges?

Yes, if Mr. Kelly's Language to Mr. Nangle had been, "The first Two Charges are admitted;" but it was impossible that Mr. Kelly could have used such Language, because my Letter did not detail the Charges; it only gave a single Charge, and this single Charge was not one of the admitted ones; therefore all that Mr. Kelly could have said was, "There are Two Charges admitted." Therefore Mr. Nangle could not have supposed there were more than those known to Mr. Kelly.

As far as Framer of a Report of this Kind, should you think you had made a fair Report upon this Subject if you believed that your Inspector had not received any Notice of those Charges from Mr. Nangle, who made the Charges, or from the Board who sent him to investigate into them, but only from Mr. Connolly the Patron, and that that Conversation had taken place subsequently, viz. that Mr. Kelly, on visiting Mr. Nangle, made the Statement to him which has been stated to you: "Your Two first Charges have been admitted by the Parties"?

Yes; but merely because they were admitted. Had Mr. Kelly said the reverse,—had he said, "Upon the Two first Charges I acquit O'Donnell," then I would have said that he acted extremely unjust, because before coming to an Acquittal of the Charges he should have seen first how far they could have been maintained, and therefore should have seen Mr. Nangle upon them in order to examine them; but I do not see what more Mr. Nangle could have desired or obtained by any Examination than he had already obtained by the Party's own Admission.

Do not you consider that Mr. Nangle believed that Mr. Kelly the Inspector knew perfectly well what the Charges were?

I cannot say; if I were to conjecture I should conjecture that he thought that Mr. Kelly did not know what the Charges were. I will give my Reason: of the Two Charges which he did get from Mr. Nangle I had only mentioned One in my Letter; Mr. Nangle told him of the other. This must have struck Mr. Kelly as a novel one, and he must have naturally expressed himself so to Mr. Nangle.

Was not Mr. Nangle's First Charge against O'Donnell that he had "headed a Procession, carrying Flags and Banners, which went to meet Dr. M'Hale on his Arrival in this Place. O'Donnell bore a Flag with the Inscription, 'Welcome Religion and Liberty!' which was sufficiently intelligible to all who knew that Dr. M'Hale is a Bishop of the Church of Rome, and the Advocate of Repeal.

Repeal. Is not that the First Charge as it appears upon the Face of Mr. Nangle's Letter of the 8th of September 1835? *T. F. Kelly, Esq.*

It is.

Will you turn to Page 16, No. 23? In the Second Paragraph it appears, "O'Donnell admits that upon the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island, met him with Green Boughs, &c. &c.;" do you conceive that to be an Admission of the Charge just read?

I do.

Will you explain how you conceive it to be an Admission of that Charge?

I conceive that each has taken his own Mode of describing this Procession. Mr. Connolly has taken the Symbol that most struck his Mind, and Mr. Nangle the one that most struck his. The latter has told us of the Banner with the Inscription, and the other of the Green Boughs. Each of them was describing one and the same Procession of Men assembled upon this Occasion by the Symbol that he thought most descriptive of their Movement. That is the Way in which I account for the Variance of the Phrase, and yet the Identity of the Charge.

Should you think it was any very serious Charge against a Roman Catholic, whether he was a Schoolmaster or not, that upon the Occasion of his Bishop coming to the Island he should have gone with Green Boughs to meet him; could that have amounted to a Charge?

It was made one.

Does it appear that Mr. Nangle says any thing about Green Boughs?

No; Mr. Nangle says a Flag; that appeared most to strike Mr. Nangle's Eye.

Do not you conceive that the main Ground of the Charge against the Man was, that he had gone with Flags having a Political Reference?

As to Political Reference it must be by reasoning that we make it so. I conceive that the Charge as made by Mr. Nangle certainly was a Charge that was rather of a grave Nature against the Teacher of a National School, because by his Description of the Procession it appeared to be of a Political Nature.

Is not it a grave Charge against any body to join in an illegal Procession, whether a Schoolmaster or not?

I do conceive that joining in an illegal Procession is against Law.

Then if a Man is accused of having gone with any illegal Symbols, calculated, under many Circumstances, to provoke a Breach of the Peace, can it be possibly said that he admits that Charge if he admits that he went out as a Roman Catholic with Green Boughs to meet his Bishop?

Yes; but I think that this is a Conclusion only to be gathered from a Review of all the Circumstances. When I turn back to the Letter of the 8th of September I find that on the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit they carried Banners. I find in the Report, "That on the Occasion of Dr. M'Hale's Visit, he, in common with the Inhabitants of the Island, met him with Green Boughs, &c." The Admission of being at this Procession, no matter whether they carried Boughs or Banners, or both, seems to be the Admission of an Act identical in Effect with the Charge.

The carrying of Green Boughs being apparently a legal Act, and the carrying of Banners being certainly not so, but admitted by you to be a Matter of grave Charge, do you think that when a Man admits the one he thereby admits the same Thing as if he admitted the other?

In this Case I do; I think they are identical. We find that both Sides they speak of a Procession to meet Dr. M'Hale. The simple Difference is, that Mr. Nangle describes it by the Banners, and Mr. Connolly, whom Mr. Kelly in his Report follows, describes it by the Green Boughs, and with an "et cetera."

Then you conceive that O'Donnell intended by the Words "Green Boughs" to confess that he bore a Banner?

Yes.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

And you conceive that by those Words O'Donnell confessed that he went with a Banner?

I do.

And the Board did not think that worthy of any grave Reprehension upon O'Donnell?

No; because, as I have already stated, they did not think so in the Cases of the Two Schoolmasters in the North, who were convicted by their own Admission of walking in a Procession of Orangemen on the 13th of July, and one of them also of even carrying a Banner in that Procession.

Then the Board did not consider that joining in illegal Processions, whether Orange Processions or of another Character, was a sufficient Ground for the grave Reprehension of a Schoolmaster?

Sufficient Ground for Reprehension, and they were all equally reprehended, but not for so severe a Punishment as Dismissal, as they all appeared equally to have offended through Ignorance. The Effort of the Commissioners is to "deal Justice in Mercy," and their Experience has found it to answer well, as it enables them to draw from or warn against Danger those poor Men who may be misled, through Ignorance, into the Commission of illegal Acts.

Now, with respect to the Second Admission of O'Donnell. The Charge is, that O'Donnell was a zealous Agent for enforcing the unsocial Commands of of Dr. M'Hale, those unsocial Commands having been preceded by cursing the Peasantry who had left the Church of Rome, and that he "forbade their Roman Catholic Neighbours to speak to them or hold any Intercourse with them in the way of Courtesy or Traffic." Then Mr. Nangle proceeds to give an Instance in which O'Donnell had marked his Zeal in supporting the Views of Dr. M'Hale; that is a Charge produced by Mr. Nangle. Then in the Third Paragraph of No. 23. comes the Admission of O'Donnell, that "he admits having had controversial Discussions with Mr. Nangle's Readers or Preachers." Do you conceive that the doing any thing so practicable as supporting the Views of the Bishop who forbade the Roman Catholics to hold any Communication with them was of the Nature of controversial Discussion, and that in admitting controversial Discussion he admits such unchristian and unsocial Conduct as that would appear to be?

In Strictness of Language I could not conceive the Two Things to be One.

Are not the Two Things perfectly different?

I think they are so, in Strictness of Language; but at the same Time these are Allegations of what passed amongst unlettered Men, and amongst angry Men, and who might call that controversial which had the Effect of preventing social Intercourse, or that unsocial which was holding a controversial Intercourse. It is impossible to say, considering their Rank of Life, and their Want of Education, what Circumstances might lead them to call it one Thing or another. The same Mistake would not take place among educated People.

This Report is signed James Kelly; is not the Description to which you have been referred made by your own Inspector?

He merely reports.

Is it possible that he could have understood by controversial Discussion Conduct such as has been described?

No; but he takes these Words descriptive of their Sentiments from themselves, and merely reports their Account in their own Representation of it; but Mr. Nangle could have settled this, for he still had it in his Power, when Mr. Kelly called on him, to bring forward this Charge in the Shape he himself had made it, and he did not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned 'till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 25° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Are all your Instructions to your Sub-Officers written with the Sanction of the Board?
All those which are written are written with the Sanction of the Board.

Then every thing that is written by you in your official Capacity is to be considered as emanating from the Board?
I should imagine it must be taken so; I am their Secretary.

Does any Copy exist of the Instructions to the Inspector, Mr. Kelly, to inquire into the first Complaint made by Mr. Nangle?
The first Complaint made by Mr. Nangle was in September 1835, and I have already stated that no Instructions were upon that Occasion given to the Inspector, the Investigation having taken place through the Correspondent of the School?

Then at what Period were the first Instructions given to Mr. Kelly to report?
On the 17th October 1835, immediately after the Second Complaint from Mr. Nangle; the Letter containing those Instructions is in the Hands of the Committee.

When did you again write to Mr. Kelly upon the Subject of Mr. Nangle's Complaint?
In July 1836, immediately after Mr. Nangle renewed his Complaints a Third Time, and added fresh Matter for Investigation.

At what Period?
In July 1836; the Correspondence then entered into is also in the Hands of the Committee.

Here is a Letter dated the 18th of July 1836; will you state whether that is yours?
It is.

You state in this Letter that Mr. Nangle for the first Time brings forward a Charge against Cassidy, the Teacher of the Duiga School, and repeats the Charge against O'Donnell of having been dismissed from the Coast-guard for using seditious Language?
Yes.

These are your Instructions to Mr. Kelly the Inspector:—"In September or October last Mr. Nangle stated that he was informed of O'Donnell's Dismissal; he now states that he has ascertained it; on the former Occasion it did not seem necessary to examine a Hearsay." On what Occasion did you inform Mr. Kelly that it was not necessary to examine into the Complaint from Hearsay?
Upon no Occasion did I inform Mr. Kelly of that, or say any thing touching such a Matter as examining a Complaint upon Hearsay, except in the Letter from which that Paragraph has been read.

The Letter goes on to say,—"But now he states a Fact, keep therefore back the Matter of the Affidavit which I sent you on Saturday." Have you got your Communication of Saturday?
No, but I have not the least Objection to state the Substance of it; it refers to

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

to an Affidavit which the Board insisted, as Ground for future Proceedings in a Court of Law, that O'Donnell should take in reference to his alleged Dismissal from the Coast-guard for using seditious Language; I understood the Committee decided I was not to produce the Affidavit, and as this Letter referred to it I apprehended therefore that it was not to be produced. The Course of this Correspondence, however, was as follows: My Letter of Saturday (the 16th of July 1836) directed Mr. Kelly the Inspector to get O'Donnell to make the Affidavit before the proper Functionary, namely, a Commissioner duly appointed to take Affidavits. Two Days subsequently, viz. upon the 18th, I again wrote to Mr. Kelly, in consequence of a Letter received that Morning from Mr. Nangle (and my Letter in its Preamble states so), which advanced, amongst other Things, the Complaint in what appeared, and in what I there stated to be, a new Shape, against O'Donnell; I therefore in my Letter of the 18th, with reference to this Subject, told Mr. Kelly to keep back or not to act upon my Instructions of the 16th Instant (Saturday), because the Allegation as to O'Donnell's Dismissal having now been brought forward in such a tangible Shape as to admit of Proof, it did not appear to me correct that O'Donnell should be permitted to take an Affidavit which would of course bind his Conscience, an Act in which I feared that Mr. Kelly might be looked upon as a Participator, until he Mr. Kelly had first, by such Inquiry or Trial as he could institute, ascertained that O'Donnell could do so with a safe Conscience. My Letter of the 18th was therefore to save O'Donnell from hastily taking an Affidavit through the Medium of the Inspector, until that Officer was first convinced by Examination of the Facts alleged that he could safely do so.

Are the Committee then to understand that this Affidavit was kept back having been already taken?

No, I have stated no such Thing; I have stated quite the contrary; I said "Do not let the Man take the Affidavit till you have first investigated the Fact."

The Words in the Letter are "Keep therefore back the Matter of the Affidavit which I sent you upon Saturday, and observe Silence as to it. If the Inquiry prove O'Donnell's Innocence then follow my Instructions of Saturday, otherwise do not."?

That exactly bears out my present Answer, "If O'Donnell appeared innocent then follow my Instructions of Saturday in letting him take the Affidavit, otherwise do not."

Was O'Donnell's Innocence of the Charge against him proved?

Your Lordships have all the Papers before you; that is Matter for your Opinion.

Do you consider O'Donnell's Innocence to be proved?

So far as the Evidence attainable could prove his Innocence I do think it proved.

Then you thought it expedient to order the Affidavit to be taken?

My Instructions of the 16th of July, already referred to, had already been acted on, and the Affidavit having been made in pursuance of these was forwarded to me; there was no subsequent Communication from me to the Inspector in regard of that Affidavit after I had received it.

But Mr. Kelly sent you the Affidavit?

He did; but in point of Time he sent me the Affidavit before he had received, much less proceeded upon, the Directions with respect to it, or to the Investigation contained in my Letter of the 18th; and if your Lordship will turn to a subsequent Report of his, dated the 24th July, and to my Letter of the 25th, you will find such to have been the Fact.

Did Mr. Kelly obey the Instructions contained in your Letter of the 18th?

He was unable to obey them all.

Which did he obey and which did he not?

He could not obey the Part which referred to the Affidavit, having already obeyed the Instructions contained in my Letter of the 16th before he received this Letter of the 18th.

Did

1835

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Did he obey all the others?

He did not obey any Part which related to Cassidy, the Teacher of the Duiga School; he may have inquired into the O'Donnell Matter, but not into the Matter relating to Cassidy, and therefore in my Letter of the 25th I desired him to obey whatever Directions I had given him in the Letter of the 18th which were still uncomplied with.

Did Mr. Kelly write you any Reason for his not having obeyed your Instructions?

Yes, a very sufficient Reason; and it is in the printed Paper before your Lordships, No. 24., his Report of the 24th of July, which he commences by stating that he had only then, namely on the 24th, received my Letter of the 18th; of course I was satisfied, as he could not be expected to obey Instructions he had not received until too late to obey them. This Circumstance however was the Occasion of my Letter of the 25th, and of a corresponding one of the same Date to Mr. Nangle.

Will you read the Third and Fourth Paragraphs of that Letter of Mr. Kelly's?

"I herewith enclose the Affidavit; O'Donnell has been most anxious for an Investigation, and states that his Dismissal from the Water-guards was caused by a private Quarrel with one of his Fellow Boatmen, who lodged a Complaint against him, and that he was dismissed without any Investigation; that he subsequently memorialized Captain Irwin, his inspecting Commander, (now stationed at Dundalk) for an Investigation, who told him he could not comply with his Request, and on his demanding to know the Cause of his Dismissal told him that he was dismissed for Insolence to a Boatman. Now, my dear Sir, I would beg to suggest that a good deal of angry Discussion, such as I anticipate will result from being obliged to bring the opposed Parties in contact with each other, might be avoided by your writing to Captain Irwin at Dundalk, requiring to know the Cause of the Dismissal of James O'Donnell, extra Boatman at the Station of Rossmore in the Year 1832, from the Service. I would also beg to remind you that the Officer is the only Person who can prove the real Cause of Dismissal, as Mr. Nangle's Proofs must rest either upon the Hearsay of Individuals or Documents which I would be very cautious in receiving as Evidence, Party Feeling raging to such an Extent in Achill that it would be impossible to define its Limits."

You thought that a sufficient Reason for his not fulfilling your Instructions?

No, I did not think that a sufficient Reason for his not fulfilling my Instructions; I took the First Paragraph of the Letter or Report of the 24th, already referred to, to be the Reason for his not fulfilling my Instructions. My Instructions were contained in the Letter of the 18th; Mr. Kelly, instead of receiving that Letter in due Course, did not receive it until Six Days after, namely, on his Return to Tuam, the Place to which it had been directed, he having left Tuam previously, in order to execute the Directions contained in my Letter of the 16th; therefore I say the First Paragraph of that Letter or Report of the 24th states satisfactorily why he did not obey the Instructions of the 18th,—simply because he had not received them in Time to obey them.

As far as relates to the Affidavit, and no further?

Yes; and therefore is it that in my Letter of the 25th I desired him to obey such Part of my Letter of the 18th as remained still uncomplied with; my Letter of the 18th countermanded my Letter of the 16th; he did not receive this Letter until after he had obeyed the Letter of the 16th; therefore in my Letter of the 25th I told him to execute whatever remained of the Directions of the Letter of the 18th, judging the Reason alleged in his Letter or Report of the 24th to be very sufficient for his not having acted in accordance with it before.

Do you think that Paragraph which you have read contains a sufficient Reason for not complying with your Orders to make an Investigation?

No; I have already stated so; I think the Paragraph which I have read refers to a distinct Thing; the Affidavit was taken as all Affidavits are, at the Peril of the Person who swore it, and Mr. Kelly got Instructions to get O'Donnell to take this Affidavit.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

What do you mean by "at the Peril of the Person"?

I mean the Peril of his Conscience; in my Letter of the 16th I had desired Mr. Kelly to go down to see that O'Donnell had taken his Affidavit before the proper Officer, namely, the Commissioner for taking Affidavits. Subsequent to that Letter of the 16th Mr. Nangle renewed his Complaints of O'Donnell in such a Way as appeared to me to be capable of Proof; I immediately wrote the Letter of the 18th, begging Mr. Kelly not to let the Man take the Affidavit till he Mr. Kelly was first satisfied, by such Investigation as Mr. Nangle then had to offer, whether O'Donnell was right or wrong in the Transaction; this Letter, which is before your Lordships, goes on to say, not to let the Man take the Affidavit if he was wrong, but to let him take it if he was right; I did that conceiving I was bound in Duty to save O'Donnell's Conscience, if he really were guilty of the Fact, from taking an Affidavit denying it. Mr. Kelly did not get this Letter of the 18th until the 24th, and when the 24th had arrived Mr. Kelly had already obeyed the Letter of the 16th by getting the Affidavit.

Will you state what Part of Mr. Kelly's Report satisfied you that he had made sufficient Inquiry into O'Donnell's Conduct?

No Part of his Report of the 24th of July satisfied me upon that Point, because I drew no Conclusion from it, as to O'Donnell, whatever; I merely received with it the Affidavit of O'Donnell; and I found in it, by Mr. Kelly's Suggestion, a Reference to a respectable Gentleman from whom Information on this Subject might be obtained.

And you pushed the Inquiry no further as to Mr. Nangle's Complaint?

No such thing; I did push the Inquiry much farther,—as far as was possible,—upon this particular Point. Your Lordships will find in the printed Correspondence lying before you, at Page 15., the Copy of a Letter addressed by me to Captain Irwin immediately upon the Receipt of Mr. Kelly's Report of the 24th of July, and Copies of Two Letters from that Gentleman in reply; your Lordships will also find in a subsequent Letter to Mr. Nangle of the 6th of August that the Matter of Inquiry was still further pushed; and your Lordships will find also, by a Document which I gave in of an Interview between Mr. Dombrain and Mr. Carlile at a still later Period upon this Subject, that the Matter was still further pushed.

Did you state to Mr. Nangle that you had made such further Inquiry?

No, I did not, and I will state the Reason; when Mr. Kelly did proceed upon that Letter to investigate those Charges Mr. Nangle then and there stated to Mr. Kelly that he would forward an Affidavit of Rutledge to prove the Charge against O'Donnell; this was a further and subsequent Act; it is in Page 18. of the printed Letters: "To prove the Charge against O'Donnell Mr. Nangle brings forward no Evidence, but merely refers to Rutledge the chief Boatman, and Captain Irwin the inspecting Commander; he however states that he will forward to the Board the Affidavit of Rutledge in substantiation of this Charge." The Board upon that acted thus: through me they informed Mr. Nangle, by Letter bearing Date the 6th of August, that they would postpone their Opinion upon the Matter until they received the Document which he proposed to forward to them; no such Document up to this Moment ever was forwarded by him, so that the Evidence of the Charge which Mr. Nangle then voluntarily offered,—and the only Evidence, and for which Mr. Nangle was subsequently told the Board would wait,—Mr. Nangle never did forward, but merely in a subsequent Letter, dated the 22d of August, Page 13., refers to Captain Irwin upon the Point.

In your Second Letter to Mr. Kelly the Inspector did not you recall that Part of your Letter which required any Inquiry into the Case of O'Donnell?

Certainly not; on the contrary the Letter referred to is very full upon this Point; it is as follows: "Should Mr. Nangle desire to go on into O'Donnell's Case as to the Dismissal from the Coast-guard, receive his Evidence, whatever it may be, and forward it. I will make the necessary Inquiry of Captain Irwin."

Had the Affidavit been taken?

The Affidavit I had in my Possession at the Time.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

You said just now that whatever was written by you was written by the Direction of the Board?
Either expressed or implied.

Has it not occasionally happened after you have received Orders upon certain Cases, that when similar Cases have occurred you have written an Answer without immediately consulting the Board?
I have; I think I stated so in a former Part of my Evidence.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. THOMAS H. CARROLL is called in, and examined as follows: Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Where do you reside?
In the Town of Carlow.

You are Editor of a Newspaper?
I am.

What is the Name of your Newspaper?
The Carlow Sentinel.

Are you a Member of the University of Dublin?
I am.

A Graduate?
A Graduate.

Of what Degree?
I took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Have you long interested yourself in the State of the Education of the Poor in your Part of Ireland?
I should think about Six or Seven Years.

Have you been resident in Carlow Six or Seven Years?
Yes.

And during the whole of that Time you have interested yourself in the State of the Education of the Poor of Carlow?
I have.

Did you find when first you began those Inquiries into the State of Education of the Poor of Carlow any Indisposition on the Part of the Roman Catholics and Protestants to be educated together?
I never did.

At that Period did you find the Roman Catholics and Protestants ready to have their Children educated together?
Yes.

How long did that Disposition continue?
I should think till within the last Four Years.

Are there many poor Children in Carlow of both Denominations, both Roman Catholics and Protestants?
A great Number.

Are the Protestant Children in Carlow as poor and as destitute of the Means of Education for themselves as the Roman Catholics generally?
In proportion to the Number they are.

Have you any Notion of how many poor Protestant Children within the Age of Education there would be in Carlow?
I should suppose there would be about 150.

Have you examined the National Schools in Carlow?
I have.

Ever since their Establishment?
Since their Establishment, but not till lately.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

How long ago did you begin to inquire into the State of the National Schools?

I inquired into the State of the National Schools within the last Two Years and a Half, but I did not visit them till within the last Two Months.

Do you find that now there is an Indisposition on the Part of the Roman Catholics and Protestants to educate their Children together in the National Schools?

I think the Protestants have a decided Objection to send their Children to the National Schools in the County of Carlow; I am speaking with reference to the County of Carlow.

With relation to the Town of Carlow, in which you say you conceive there are about 150 Children of the Age for Education, in that Place in particular do you find that the Protestants are unwilling to send their Children to the National Schools?

I am quite sure that no Protestant Child attends the Schools.

From your own personal Observation have you understood that?

I have.

What have you understood to be the Reason of that Objection on the Part of the Parents of the poor Protestant Children?

From the Conduct of the Managers and the Masters of the National Schools, I conceive that to be one Objection.

By the Managers what do you mean?

I mean the corresponding Manager of the Board.

Who is that?

Mr. Hume and Mr. Mahir; I am not aware that he is a Correspondent of the Board, but I am aware that he is a Visitor.

Is the Roman Catholic Bishop a Manager of the School?

I am aware that he is a Visitor, and is much interested in the Welfare of the National School.

Are you aware that he interferes in the Management of it?

I have seen him frequently collecting Subscriptions for it, and visiting the Schools.

Do you know any Facts relative to any of those Parties; first, the Managers, which are the Cause of the Indisposition of the Protestants to send their Children to those Schools?

In the first instance the Managers take a very active Part in Politics in Carlow.

By taking an active Part in Politics do you mean that they exhibit any extraordinary Violence?

Very much so indeed.

Which of the Three Managers are you going to speak of first?

I am speaking of Mr. Mahir.

Will you state any Instances that have come to your Knowledge?

He has within the last Six Years attended almost all the Public Meetings that have taken place in the County, and has appeared on all Occasions at the public Hustings, and has denounced the Protestant Gentry, generally speaking, and the middle Classes in Ireland in so furious a Manner as to excite a good deal of Indignation on the Part of the Protestants in that Part of the Country.

Have you heard him?

I have.

Will you state what you have heard him say?

I have Documents here.

What is it you have in your Hand?

I have a Copy of Mr. Mahir's Speeches at various public Meetings from my own Short-hand Notes; a Copy of my own Notes taken down by myself in Short-hand at the Period of his delivering those Speeches.

Is Mr. Mahir a Manager of the National School?

I am not aware that he is any thing more than a Visitor.

What

What Knowledge have you of his Connexion with this School?
First, from his being the Parish Priest and Administrator of the Parish, and secondly, seeing him visit it very frequently.

You have seen him frequently go to the School?
Frequently.

Have you ever heard Mr. Mahir say any thing of those Schools?
I do not recollect that I have.

Does Mr. Mahir frequently collect Money for the Schools?
He does.

How do you know that?
I have seen him myself, and the Schoolmaster, frequently.

Is not that as Parish Priest?
As Administrator; he is Administrator of the Parish.

What do you mean by the Administrator?
The Parish belongs to the Bishop.

Do you mean merely that he is the Priest of the Parish?
I do; as far as I am acquainted with the Form of the Roman Catholic Church it is this, that he performs all the Duties of the Bishop within the Parish in the Absence of the Bishop.

He is the Bishop's Curate?
He is his Locum tenens.

You mean the Duties of the Bishop as Parish Priest?
Yes.

You do not mean as Bishop?
Certainly not.

You have seen this Person in this Character going often to the School, and collecting Money for the School?
I have.

How do you know it was for the School?
Because they called frequently at my Office for Subscriptions, and they called upon Friends of mine for Subscriptions, and I was called upon myself for Subscriptions.

Did Mr. Mahir call upon you for Subscriptions for the School?
Never upon myself, but upon Friends of mine.

How do you know that?
Because they told me so.

Have you seen him going round collecting Money?
I have, from House to House.

Do you know that that Money was for the School?
I have been told; and I am perfectly aware, as far as moral Evidence can convince me, that it was for the School.

It was as Parish Priest that he was collecting for a Work of Charity in his Parish?
It was.

But this Work of Charity being the National School?
It was.

Did your Friends tell you themselves that this Gentleman had applied to them for Money for the National School?
They did; and more than that, they told me that they would not give him any Subscription at all, in consequence of his Conduct and the Mode in which the School was conducted.

You state that this Gentleman, the Roman Catholic Clergyman, was a Visitor of these Schools, and that you have frequently seen him go into the Schools; were you ever in the Schools with him at the same Time?
Never.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is again called in, and further examined as follows:

Will you state to the Committee, if you know the Fact, whether Mr. Mahir, the Parish Priest of Carlow or exercising the Functions of Parish Priest, is the Patron or Correspondent of the National Board with respect to the School at Carlow?

I refer for my Answer to the Report of 1836; the front Page of it states the Name of the Correspondent. The Commissioners indiscriminately use the Terms "Patron" and "Correspondent."

Is he the Manager of the School?

They also call the Patron by that Name; either Patron, Manager, or Correspondent.

Do you mean to say that if there is only One Correspondent there is only One Manager of the School?

No, I could not say that in every Case; there has ever been some Difficulty from Circumstances in respect of this. The Knowledge of the Board is generally confined to One Individual for each School; but from Time to Time Documents necessary to be certified by more than One are certified by more than One, and accordingly they know that there are more than One interested in the Affairs of the School; and from Time to Time they are told that the Committee meet, and accordingly they know that there is a Committee superintending. This is the Reason wherefore, in the Return to an Order of the House of Lords, the Commissioners could not give a List of such Persons other than as there mentioned.

Has the Board, as far as you recollect, ever received any Communications respecting the School at Carlow from the Reverend James Mahir?

I cannot immediately reply from Memory, but I will immediately make search.

What do the Board understand by the Term "Visitor"?

They understand by the Term "Visitor" what is generally meant by the Term; a Person who enters into a Schoolhouse and sees how the Schools are going on, and who generally, as an Evidence of his having inspected it, writes down his Remarks in the Report Book.

Would you consider the Priest of any Parish, or the Protestant Clergyman of any Parish, taking an Interest in the School situated in that Parish, as a Visitor?

Yes; they are looked upon as ex officio Visitors. The Rules of the Commissioners provide that whether the Clergymen have signed the Application or not they have a Right to visit the School.

So that any Clergyman of either Persuasion frequenting the School in his own Parish would, without any Selection or Nomination by the Board, be considered by them as a Visitor as a Matter of course?

He would; the Right is secured by this Rule, and Submission to it is required in the original Application for Aid, before Aid is granted.

Are not all the Gentry of the Country permitted to visit the School if they think proper?

They are permitted. It was mainly for the Purpose of inviting public Attention and Inspection that the Inscription "National School" is put up outside on each National Schoolhouse.

Then in fact you do not consider the Clergy more Visitors in that point of view than any other Gentry who choose to go there as Visitors?

Not exactly so; the Commissioners consider the Clergy as ex officio Visitors, having thought it material to secure to them the right of Access by express Rule.

The Board considered it an Invitation and an Encouragement to the Clergy of all Persuasions to interest themselves in those Schools?

Yes.

Would

491

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Would the Board consider any Clergyman so visiting those Schools as entitled to interfere in the way of Remark, Expostulation, or Advice, or otherwise in the Management of the Schools?

Certainly, in the way of Advice; but if your Lordships will turn to the Rule upon that Point you will find that they are not to disturb the School nor to interfere with it, out of respect for the Authority and Office of the Master; but in each School there is a Report Book, with a blank Space for the Insertion of any Advice or Suggestion that the Visitor may see fit to write.

They might advise or write their Suggestions either in the Book or to the Board?

Yes.

Your Inspector is desired to be equally forbearing with regard to the Master?

Yes, equally so.

And only to advise in the Presence of the Master?

Our Inspectors have a Degree of Power beyond that which Visitors possess; the Instruction to the Inspector is to examine the Classes themselves, and to act the Part of a Schoolmaster during the Time he is visiting the School.

Is it not possible that an active Visitor might exercise notoriously a very great Influence upon the Conduct or Well-being of a School?

I certainly think so; therefore the Board have been very desirous, and would be most anxious, that the Gentry of the Place where the School is situated should interest themselves in it.

In case of the Parish Priest of Carlow, the Administrator of the Bishop Dr. Nolan, who is the Correspondent of the Board, being the Religious Instructor of the School, and often going to visit it, should you consider that he was a Manager?

Yes, I certainly should, in the popular Sense of the Word.

Can you under your Rule exclude the Parochial Clergy from visiting the School?

No; on the contrary the Commissioners secure to them the Right of Access.

Are they not Visitors in right of being Parish Priests or being Clergymen?

They are Visitors in the Right of being Clergymen.

Of the Parish?

The Rule does not define it so narrowly as to say of the Parish; it says Clergymen.

Supposing them to behave ill in other respects, can you take their general Conduct into consideration, and prevent them from visiting the Schools?

Such a Case has never arisen; I can imagine how the Board would act did it arise if any immoral Conduct were to be established against a Manager——

The Question refers not to Immorality, but to any violent political Feelings?

I think the Board is protected in Two Ways from Evil arising from a Visitor of that Description. First, that he is not permitted to interfere or disturb the Management of the School; he may write his Suggestions in the Report Book; and again, he may correspond with the Board in regard of what he wishes; and in either of the Two Ways whatever Alteration he would wish would come before the Eyes of the Board; whatever Alterations were in these Suggestions the Commissioners would at once put in a course of Examination, in order to ascertain whether they were beneficial for the School or not; and if the Suggestion had reference to the Character of the Teacher of the School, or any thing connected with it, they would put it also into a course of Examination.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Mr. THOMAS H. CARROLL is again called in, and further examined as follows:

Do you know any Fact respecting Dr. Nolan the Roman Catholic Bishop in Carlow; do you know any Part of his Conduct which has tended to prevent Protestant Parents from letting their Children go to the School?
Nothing has fallen under my Cognizance; but from the Speeches I have seen of his, and also his Letters, I should say that his Letters and Speeches tend in my Estimation to alienate the People from the Schools.

Those Speeches and Letters which you have seen were they published in the public Journals of the Place?
They were.

Were they published in your Journal?
Not in mine; I never published one of them.

Were they published in other Journals?
Yes, in the Town of Carlow.

Can you name the other Journals?
The Journal patronized by the Carlow College.

What is the Carlow College?
A Seminary for the Education of young Men for the Roman Catholic Church.

Is Dr. Nolan the Bishop connected with the Carlow College?
For Years he was one of the Professors of that Institution; at present I am not aware that he is in any way officially connected with it.

Excepting as Bishop?
Excepting as Bishop.

How long is it since he ceased to be connected with it as Professor?
Since the Death of Dr. Doyle.

When was that?
I suppose about Two Years and a Half ago.

Then he has had no Connexion with the College the last Two Years and a Half?
Not that I am aware of.

What is the Name of the Journal that the College patronize?
The Leinster Independent.

As Bishop does Dr. Nolan reside in Carlow?
He resides in the immediate Neighbourhood, within less than a Quarter of a Mile.

That College for the Education of Roman Ecclesiastics being in the immediate Neighbourhood of the Bishop, do you or do you not know whether that is under the Control of the Bishop?
I am not aware.

Have you any Newspaper with you that purports to give any Speech of Dr. Nolan, or any Letter subscribed with the Name of Dr. Nolan?
I have not, but I can procure them for this Committee if they require.

Have you had an Opportunity of hearing yourself Words of the Nature alluded to fall from Dr. Nolan?
Never.

Do you know that the Protestant Children were kept back from the School by the Conduct of any of the Teachers or Managers of the School?
I am aware that no Protestant has attended the School at all for perhaps Two or Three Years, but I am not prepared to give a decisive Answer to that Question, because I am not aware for the last Three Years that any Protestant has attended the School.

493

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Do you know of any thing in the Conduct of the Teachers or Managers that has prevented the Attendance of the Protestants?
I do.

Is what you are going to attest within your own Knowledge?
It is. The first Part I shall refer to of the Conduct of the Schoolmaster is his Connexion with the public Inquiry which took place in the Town of Carlow, a Military Investigation.

When was this?
It commenced on the 15th of October 1835.

What Paper are you now reading from?
From my own Paper, I have an official Report here in Short-hand, and these are the Reports taken from my own Notes.

Will you state the Name and the Date of the Newspaper?
The Carlow Sentinel of the 17th of October.

You stated that the Account was an official one; how do you state it to be official?
I attended the entire Military Inquiry during the Period of Thirteen Days; I reported the entire myself in Short-hand, and from my own Notes in Short-hand I published a most accurate and faithful Report in the Carlow Sentinel.

Upon what Occasion?
Upon the Military Investigation at which Colonel Warre was President.

And you believe that to be perfectly correct?
I am certain of it.

When did this Inquiry take place?
It commenced on the 15th of October 1835.

How long is it that you have said no Protestants had attended that School?
I think I stated that I knew within the last Two or Three Years no Protestants have attended.

What took place in your Presence, and of which you took Notes at the Time, from which you state that is an accurate Transcript?
The Schoolmaster Gorman appeared at the Court House during the entire Investigation; the Rev. Mr. Mahir appeared in the Character of Counsel against the Military, and the Schoolmaster appeared daily there as Prompter, pushing the Witnesses on the Table, and bringing them from every Part of the Town, and his Conduct upon the Occasion was of so extraordinary a Nature that upon every Occasion when a Witness came on the Table the President and the Agent for the Defendants invariably asked him who prompted him or who sent him to the Court, whether it was the Chapel Schoolmaster as he was termed, the Schoolmaster of the National Board.

Is the School adjacent to the Chapel?
It is; and he officiates as Clerk of the Chapel.

Is it within the Bounds of the Chapel Yard?
No, it is not. Upon that Occasion a Witness appeared named Patrick Nolan, and on being asked who sent him to the Place, a Portion of his Evidence is to this Effect:—"Had you any Communication with Mr. Mahir, or the Schoolmaster, or any other Person?—(*Witness.*) I had not.——Did they tell you what you had to say?—(*Witness.*) They read out of a Paper for me all I had to say.——Did they tell you what you had to say?—(*Witness.*) Yes, they did.——(*Mr. Molony, that was the Magistrate.*) Can you read?—(*Witness.*) I cannot.——(*Mr. Molony.*) Who read it for you?—(*Witness.*) I cannot; I do not know his Name, but I would know his Person.——(*Colonel Warre.*) Do you know the Chapel Schoolmaster?—(*Witness.*) I do.——(*Mr. Molony.*)—Was it he read it for you?—(*Witness.*) It was.——(*Mr. Molony.*) Is his Name Gorman?—(*Witness.*) It is.——(*Mr. Molony.*) How long do you know him?—(*Witness.*) About a Year."

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

After this had passed did any thing else occur in the course of the Day?
It did; one of the Witnesses at the Conclusion of his Evidence stated that he would not have attended against the Military were it not for the Threats held out to him by Gorman in case he would not comply with Mr. Mahir's Wishes.

Did the Court come to any Decision relative to the Charges against the Military upon that Occasion?
I am not aware of the Decision the Court came to immediately, but I am aware of the Decision of the Government upon the Occasion.

What was the Decision of the Government?
That the Charges against the Military were frivolous, and not borne out by any Evidence.

Then was the Result that this Evidence was disbelieved which had been stated to have been given under this Instruction of Gorman?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 28° Aprilis 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

You were desired to refresh your Memory as to the Question whether Mr. Mahir, the Parish Priest of Carlow, was or was not in the Relation of a Manager of the National School at that Place. Will you state the Result of your Inquiry?

I find that Mr. Mahir never was a Patron of this School, and that he never did any Act in relation to the School. I find his Name during the whole Course of the Connexion of the School with the Board, from the Year 1832 up to the present Day, but once; and that was upon an Occasion when an official Document directed to the Reverend Mr. Hackett, who had been from the first the Correspondent and Patron of this School, in the Year 1835, came back signed by Mr. Mahir as Administrator, along with Two other Names as Managers. I do not find that any Letter in reply was sent to Mr. Mahir, in consequence of his having so signed that Document, or that any Notice was taken of him afterwards in consequence of it.

He never was recognized by the Board in the Character of Manager?

Never.

Here is the Paper of Queries you have spoken of, and it is signed James Mahir, Administrator, G. F. Hume, Secretary, and Robert Lanor, Treasurer, Managers. Will you look at this Paper, and state whether Mr. Mahir is not represented here as a Manager?

Yes.

Does the Answer to Query 5. appear to you to be in the Handwriting of Mr. Mahir?

It certainly looks like the Handwriting in which the Signature James Mahir is written.

Will you look at the Back of this Paper, and see what Name is put there, and how he is designated?

James Mahir, Administrator, Manager, Carlow Post Town, 13th September 1835.

Do you undertake to say that in September 1835 Mr. Mahir was not the Manager of Carlow School?

Yes; I have said already that upon that single and solitary Occasion only Mr. Mahir attached his Name to that Document, directed not to him but to the Reverend William Hackett. The Document was forwarded from the Office addressed to the Reverend William Hackett at Carlow, who was the Correspondent of the School. The Document came back signed as I have already stated and pointed out. I find no Trace in my Letter Book of any Communication with him; I find no Trace of any Letter to Mr. Mahir before or since that, and I find no Document in the Office signed by Mr. Mahir, saving this one.

Who was Mr. Hackett?

He was a Roman Catholic Clergyman, the Correspondent for the School.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Has he signed that Paper?
No. I understand he had died just previously to its being sent.

Was not that the preliminary Paper that was required previous to any Grants being made, or the School being brought into Connexion with the Board?
No; this was merely a Paper which is sent half-yearly to each School to be signed previous to the Salary, which in this Case had been awarded in the Year 1832, being paid at that particular Time in 1835, a Half Year being then due.

Did you deal with this Paper in consequence of this Signature so as to give the Board's Money and other Matters as usual?
Certainly. I took it as an authentic Paper.

Were you aware at the Time that Mr. Hackett was dead?
Not at the Time this Paper was sent, but understood it after the Paper came back signed by Mr. Mahir.

But the Fact was, as you understood afterwards, that Mr. Hackett was dead, and that Mr. Mahir signed in consequence?
Yes; and this was the only Document signed by Mr. Mahir, for similar Documents to this, which were forwarded for the Two subsequent Half Years, in 1836, were not signed by Mr. Mahir, nor had they been forwarded to him.

What is the Meaning of the Term "Administrator"?
I understand the Term as the Locum tenens of the Parish Priest, or his Substitute.

Will you state who signed those Papers for the Year 1836?
Those Papers are signed by the Right Reverend Dr. Nolan, the Reverend C. F. Hume, and Mr. Robert Lanor.

Mr. Mahir's Name never recurred again after that One Instance?
No, nor before it.

But that was on the 13th of September 1835?
So it bears Date.

Have you any Doubt that that is an accurate Representation?
No.

Will you look at it again; do not you see a Blot after the Name of Mahir?
I do.

What do you apprehend that to have been?
Adm., meaning Administrator.

Administrator is not a Word that you recognize as connected with the Board?
No.

You understand it to mean the Clergyman who in a Parish attached to a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland acts as the Parish Priest?
Yes.

It is in point of fact as if he had signed James Mahir, P. P., Manager?
It is.

Do you now mean to say that at the present Period, and during the Period subsequent to the Year 1835, you have not considered Mr. Mahir as connected with that School as a Director or Patron?
No, nor previously; it was a single Occurrence. I think I stated that the Definition of the Term "Manager" was rather unsettled and loose; that whoever put themselves forward as Managers were generally dealt with as such, but not with the same Confidence or held in the same Responsibility as the accredited Correspondent. This Person signed his Name as Manager, and it would have been an Affront to have returned the Paper because he had so signed himself, as he appeared upon the Face of it to be a Clergyman. The

Document

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Document was signed by the Secretary of the Committee, and another also. Mr. Mahir was not dealt with by him as Manager, either before or after.

Although you said that the Correspondents are the only Persons you recognize, have not you said that in a looser Sense there are others who are Managers?

Yes, I did say so.

In that loose Sense do not you conceive that the Parish Priest of Carlow, supposing him to have been proved to have frequently visited the School, and to be returned in one of your own Returns as giving Religious Instruction in the School, and then taking upon himself in this Instrument to call himself Manager, did concern himself with the Management of the School at that Time when he so signed himself?

Yes; at the Time of receiving that particular Document I looked upon him (in that loose Mode of defining the Word alluded to) as a Manager; but neither before nor since that has his Name ever occurred in our Transactions, and neither before nor since that do I trace in the Office the slightest Communication from him to me as the Secretary of the Board.

Do you consider him as having acquired any new Character in the Eyes of the Board, subsequently to that Signature appearing, from what he had before?

I knew of him but at that Period; and neither before nor since that have I ever seen his Name attached to any Document; and his Name being attached to that Document did not produce any Communication to him.

Do your Inspectors report to the Board the Names of those that take an active Part in visiting and superintending the Schools?

No; not generally.

Then Mr. Mahir, or any other Individual, might be in the habit of attending the School every Day, visiting, and influencing and directing all the Course of its Proceedings, without the Board knowing any thing upon the Subject?

He might; but if he visited every Day and gave Religious Instruction, in that Case the Inspector would report it, because upon the Front of the Inspector's Report there is a Blank for the Name of the Religious Instructor to be inserted. In such Case, the Person whose Name was given in as the Person giving Religious Instruction I would look to as interfering a good deal in the Management of the School.

If an Individual visiting a School as the Religious Instructor interfered beyond the Sphere of the Religious Instruction, and was in the habit of doing so, would it become the Subject of the Inspector's Report?

I think it would, if it came to his Knowledge.

Is he instructed to inquire into such a Circumstance?

His Instructions are specific so far as the Queries in his Report Sheet; but they are also general to report generally every Matter affecting the State of a School, and therefore I think that coming under his Cognizance he would feel it his Duty to report it.

In point of fact, might not that happen without its coming under the Cognizance of the Inspector, and therefore without being reported to the Board?

I think it might.

Is not there a Book kept in the School for Visitors to enter their Names?

There is.

Are not the Visitors required or supposed to enter their Names?

They are invited and supposed so to do.

Are not the Inspectors required to look at the Book?

They are.

By that Means have not the Inspectors a Means of ascertaining who the Visitors of those Schools are, and the Frequency of their Visits?

They have occasionally found it entered in the Inspectors Reports that an

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Individual has visited; but I found few Notices of such Entries, and generally the Notices which I have found have been Notices of Visits by those who are recognized as the Correspondents of the School.

Have the Schoolmasters Instructions to present those Books for Signature to the Visitors?
Yes; it is left with the Schoolmaster for that Purpose.

Is not it generally understood by the Clerical Visitors that such is the Rule of the Board?
I should think it was so.

Must not the necessary Consequence of that practically be, that it would enable the Inspector to make a Report of the Frequency of the Visits of the Visitors?
Yes; provided that the Visitors make Entries in those Books, or that Persons visit at all. I have stated that, gathering my Knowledge from the Reports of the Inspectors, I have found a Note occasionally of Visits made by Visitors; but they have been few and seldom, and generally the Visits have been by the actual Correspondent of the School.

Are you acquainted with the last Report of the Inspector with regard to the Carlow School?
I am.

Is there any Report with regard to the Frequency of the Visits of the Visitors?
No, I do not find any Entry.

You have said that the Visitors are supposed by the Board to enter their Names; are they required by the Board to enter their Names?
No. There is given a Report Book to the Master of each National School, with the general Direction that this Book is to be left open for all Visitors to enter their Suggestions in.

There is no Rule of the Board further than what you have stated?
No; they could not put a Rule upon Visitors or upon those over whom they have no Control.

Is not the necessary Result of that State of Things that any Person being a Visitor might visit perpetually and never enter his Name in the Book at all?
He might, and so far the Board may labour under a Disadvantage. They specifically put a Query in the Report as to what Suggestions the Inspectors left upon their former Visit to the School, and whether those Suggestions have been attended to; but they introduce no specific Query as to the Suggestions made by a Stranger.

Is it not possible that this Gentleman who signed his Name "Manager" in the Paper that has been shown to you might have been perpetually attending the School as a Visitor, and might have interfered influentially, for any thing the Board knew to the contrary, in the Proceedings of the School, and yet never have signed his Name; and all this have passed without the Board having the Means of knowing it?
It possibly might have been so. His Name is entered in the Report of 1835 as giving Religious Instruction in the School.

With respect to the Term "Administrator," you explained it to have some Connexion with the Duties of the Parish; might it be some private Relation in which he stood to the deceased Gentleman?
I have found it so often attached to the Names of the Roman Catholic Clergy that I understand it to mean a spiritual Relationship.

The Witness delivers in the following Paper, which is read:

499

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

PROVINCE OF ULSTER.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
ANTRIM.		
Edenderry	61	25
Springfield	56	25
Ligoniel	89	13
Whitehouse	99	65
Ballycraigy	118	—
Lunmurry	71	—
Carnmoney	44	—
Carnmoney, No. 2.	75	3
Carrickfergus, No. 2.	38	4
Carrickfergus, Male	197	12
Hightown	40	—
Woodburn	66	10
Upper Falls	78	2
Collin	37	5
Hannahstown, Male	3	35
Ballintoag	90	5
Lyle Hill	76	—
Malusk	106	4
Ballymena	88	40
Clinty	124	2
Carmavey	—	60
Kilcross	69	4
Straidhavern	60	—
Crosshill	36	1
Ballycarry	63	—
Kilroot	48	2
Windygap	65	2
Glynn (Village)	39	2
Mullagmossin	40	1
Glenoe	79	—
Foreagh	56	—
Ballyvallough	81	—
Ballysnodd	67	—
Craiganorme	42	15
Kilwaughter	63	4
Ballycraigy, No. 2.	40	2
Loughmorne, No. 1.	73	3
Witchthorn	49	—
Loughmorne, No. 2.	60	—
Larne, Male	82	43
Ballylaggin	44	—
Ballygowan	120	—
Mullochsandal	6	50
Ballycor	68	6
Ballyboley	58	—
Cairn Castle	35	10
Feystown	27	50
Harphall	23	40
Glenariffe	1	117
Kilmore	40	79
Lower Dromore	8	55
Craigsdunluffe	6	96
Cushendall	32	75
Glensheask	5	117
Breen	18	109
Cloughcorr	85	35
Moyaver	40	73
Moyarget	80	10
Watercloney	10	32
Killygarron	2	87
Kerachrun	10	28
Gallough	5	127
Moneynick	9	112
Maherahoney	15	58
Broughshane	121	13
Feystown	20	46
Laymore	70	—
Glenbuck	19	25
Tanaghmore	23	80
Magheralane	5	57
Upper Tannybrache	72	8
Farin Hough	6	79
ANTRIM—*continued.*		
Randalstown	35	89
Frederick Street, Female	161	53
Dungonnell, Infant	15	5
Killead Meeting House	26	6
Ballylinney	37	—
Donegal Street, Female	—	303
Frederick Street, Infant	68	39
Donegal Street, Male	2	377
Frederick Street, Male	298	107
Ballyguillane	75	22
Skilganaban	54	3
Bruslee	72	—
Ballyvallough	69	—
Ballypalliday	51	3
Dungonnell, No. 2.	83	—
Ballyclare, No. 2.	36	2
Ballyclare	74	10
Duncrew	78	6
Tildarg	55	—
Loagh	112	—
Coalane	60	19
Megabbery	55	—
Mullicarton	58	5
Ballycarrickmaddy	104	4
Moneynick	9	112
Maheralue	5	57
Blackhill	46	—
Windygap	59	1
Kilroot	32	2
ARMAGH.		
Dorsey	54	120
Tullyvallen	57	30
Mullaghduff	50	30
Cortamlet	80	20
Tannaghmore	65	45
Richmount	86	22
Annagora	42	41
Ballywelly, Male	84	30
Charlemont Place	180	6
Killooney	34	108
Armagh	3	444
Ballynahinch	141	7
Rickhill	48	5
Temple Meeting House	108	6
Blundel's Grange	26	40
Tolea	—	109
Market Hill	25	57
Poynts Pass	16	101
Cloghogue	—	213
CAVAN.		
Gorteen	7	162
Curleugan	20	113
Ballynarry, Female	5	150
Bally Jamesduff	25	145
Cappenagh	16	141
Whitegate	2	78
Aughawel	5	145
Lougheyduff	—	259
Kilcogny	6	257
Drumlaney	20	91
Milltown	1	151
Kilcorby	37	86
Kildallon	—	83
Derravona	3	51
Cornadaragh	37	6
Drumbarry	14	114
Coronary	70	18
Kilcunny	20	40
Kilnaleck	12	334
Carrick	—	60

Note.—Several typographical and clerical Errors having been discovered in this Return since the same was printed for the Committee, an amended Return was afterwards delivered in, which will be found in the Appendix, No. 4. p. 1419.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
Donegal.		
Glengioney	2	184
Drung	—	48
Clunelly	—	75
Carrickmaguigley	11	23
Cabry	44	31
Terryroan	12	78
Ballylawn	40	50
Gulladuff	2	79
Moville	33	31
Glentaugher	3	82
Ballychairy	10	92
Boeau	13	178
Aughaclay	—	90
St. Patrick's	8	162
Glassalts	31	80
Creytown	1	47
Malin Head	2	91
Cockhill	19	117
Birdstown	39	42
Glencar	24	35
Letterkenny	2	108
Straham	22	74
Ahadachor	47	73
Derrybeg	—	117
Currin	—	65
Carnaghanagh	7	45
Leighland	—	72
Murlog	10	104
Ballybogan	15	66
Cloughfin	17	70
Port Hall	15	50
Gortuhar	—	103
Keonaghan	14	196
Altaughderry	59	16
Caramore	4	88
Down.		
Newry (Male)	3	240
Lambeg	94	10
High Street	12	550
Creighton's Green	43	—
Ballygraney	38	—
Ballyrogan	85	2
Ballykeel	69	9
Hollywood	104	10
Craigantlet	60	—
Ballycullen	107	3
Greengraves	66	—
Ballystockart	61	—
Ballymaglaff	66	—
Tullygirvin	95	—
Carryduff	128	4
Lagan Village	18	17
Collysburn	1	39
Conlig	125	—
Moneydera	18	77
Loughin Island	10	75
Ballee	47	9
Derreboy	28	10
Crossgar	4	43
Ballyhornan	8	12
Rossglass	9	16
Bright	31	11
Ballymoney	6	93
Ardaghy	124	62
Lower Kilcoo	1	181
Ballynahinch	—	91
Ballymacreely	83	1
Dorans Rock	55	56
Aughlishnafin	3	27
Hilltown	4	52
Kinghill	3	63
Tannaghmore	85	8
Ballymeeashan	41	1
Ardmillan	107	—
Annsboro'	46	66

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
Down—*continued.*		
Crawfordsburn	139	5
Lower Ballyblack	71	—
Carradore	112	3
Kircubbin	125	8
Tullycavy	64	5
Ballyhalbert	100	—
Ballywalter	84	—
Ballykinlon	10	138
Ballyalley, Female	6	104
Dromore	143	63
Donaghcloney	40	8
Reilley's Trench	20	18
Tullymacaratt	80	12
Kilsorrell	61	10
Muninabane	6	128
Magheramia	9	125
Leganany	20	100
Loughbrickland	—	123
Bann	36	85
Moyallen	140	90
Magherally	108	3
Mulligans	72	28
Tullintanvally	58	80
Barrenmeen	6	157
Magherell	10	73
Fermanagh.		
Laragh	26	41
Drumgarrow	45	20
Mullinisker	50	112
Tullylammy	57	20
Rossinan	20	17
Shankhill	12	60
Carrickmackna	16	67
Crossroads or Derrylister	19	94
Killee	48	50
Ashwoods	20	40
Drumall	54	36
Lisnarick	60	37
Drumculleon	88	24
Llee	56	68
Tulnaguigy	28	38
Roscor	45	22
Moat	—	101
Enniskiller	4	116
Moorlough	30	127
Drumbarry	38	74
N. T. Butler	—	112
Graghawarren	—	103
Deer Park	1	39
Bruskernagh	—	145
Rosbrick	11	69
Mullaghfad	29	38
Gubb	—	67
Derrylinn	40	150
Stone Park	10	61
Manor Waterhouse	70	71
Drumlone	57	100
Londonderry.		
Roemill	12	48
Ballynarrig	57	23
St. Columbs	—	458
Lower Comber	107	41
Glendermott	—	207
Shantallow	61	159
Sheriffs Mountain	10	36
Ballycarton	7	43
Ballymaclary	20	78
Carramena	40	4
Cranagh Hill	36	16
Gateside	41	—
Ballyclaber	71	9
Ringsend	9	66
Maghermore	49	26
Lisnascreagh	1	137

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
LONDONDERRY—*continued.*		
Tyance	1	102
Greenlough	23	17
Glenone	9	98
Anahorish	11	77
Currau	55	30
Grange	24	5
Maherafelt	42	12
Ballymuldery	45	100
Knocknagon	1	45
Labby	19	55
Straw	—	81
Draperstowncross	15	61
Altayesky	3	47
Monashinare	28	32
Derrynoid	9	51
Brachaghdysart	—	62
Brachaghrowley	5	69
Killgtenny	83	9
Drumard	15	60
Mowilliam	25	25
MONAGHAN.		
Unshena	59	27
Killafuddy	—	150
Granshaw	12	98
Largy	17	147
Laurel Hill	18	124
Drumgarley	38	62
Aughaboy	5	113
Aughnasheloy	—	99
Cohen	25	79
Drumhilla	40	65
Tossey	37	35
Carrickaslane	49	19
Liscenau	123	8
Mullaghanee	48	1
Leitrim	5	254
Knocknagrave	6	188
Derreboy	2	220
TYRONE.		
Corvanaghau	51	52
Moy	18	60
Rarogau	30	73
Gort	18	35

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
TYRONE—*continued.*		
Glencull	14	140
Attaghmore	45	92
Carryglass	12	43
Tattymoile	7	55
Blackfort	20	146
Mullinooney	50	17
Omagh	34	178
N. Stewart	68	104
Strabane	23	—
Cloughcorr	74	119
Donagheady	74	25
Killetter	40	28
Maherakell	26	39
Altamullen	60	19
Aghnahoo	45	15
Lisnacloon	80	17
Kilcleen	41	18
Mount Barnard, Female	35	17
Castlederg	33	20
Goland	34	32
Ginvahan	65	7
Carriconghau	10	45
Corboley	6	111
Tumery	—	93
Five-mile Town	84	38
Eskra	24	30
Ballyscally	17	44
Killyclougher	22	68
Tatreconaught	12	16
Castleroddy	38	63
Carrigau	24	16
Lisnacreaght	10	39
Tullymuck	2	131
Garvahullion	7	66
Tanderagee	10	90
Creggan	—	54
Aughiogan	—	93
Trumogue	—	87
Lisnagleer	33	33
Slate-quarry	22	95
Stranagalwilly	6	69
Loughash	13	35
Clogherney	5	46
Castledampts	35	11
Gallon	—	44

PROVINCE OF MUNSTER.

CLARE.		
Killdysart	4	99
Belvoir	—	180
Kildysart	7	297
CORK.		
Blarney	—	114
Blarney Lane	—	119
County Gaols	24	93
County Gaols	8	102
Sundays Well	—	55
Cove	—	675
Brickfields	—	42
Knockrahoe	—	146
Cecilstown	—	134
Freemount	2	198
Kilbollane	6	469
Liscarrol	2	232
Mitchelstown	12	450
Clondillane	—	168
Fermoy, Male	3	593
Ballyhooly	5	243
Glenvilley	—	246
Kildinan	—	172
Middleton	—	355

CORK—*continued.*		
Middleton, Female	—	360
Ballintowlas	—	183
Churchtown	—	201
Ahada	—	127
Ballytibbet	—	211
Ballyknock	—	82
Killeaghe	—	150
Inche	—	162
Clonpriest	—	295
Youghal, Male	—	492
Ballinoe	—	196
Curry Glass	6	93
KERRY.		
Knockatee	3	52
Tralee	—	279
Cahirceween	—	267
Do. Female	—	7
Tralee	—	78
Dingle	1	221
Do. Female	—	253
Ferriter	—	120
Blenerville	—	73
Cullina	4	102

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
KERRY—*continued.*		
Killarney	—	479
Inche	—	167
Cliddaghe	—	227
Lisnamuck	—	188
Bruff	—	280
Knockaney	—	161
TIPPERARY.		
Sopwell	23	113
Lorha	—	112
Do. Female	1	81
Gorteen	—	171
Nenagh, Female	—	88
Do. Male	—	223
Bird Hill	—	66
Drom	3	136
Heagh	—	174
Garangrena	—	117
Toomavara	—	42
Templetoohy	7	95
Ballycahill	—	130
Do. Female	—	162
Ballynockin	—	65
Toher	1	85
Moyne	6	158
Boolabeha	2	166
Gortnahoe	—	132
Ballysloe	—	88
Graigue	—	182
Urard	—	109
New Bermingham	3	196
Clonimicloin	2	157
Carrickonsuir, Female	—	397
Templeteeny	—	147
Kilcashe	—	106
Do. Female	—	81
TIPPERARY—*continued.*		
Tipperary, Male	—	114
Do. Female	—	159
Kilcummin	—	144
Solohead	—	70
Caher, Female	—	92
Do. Male	—	145
Rockwell	—	100
WATERFORD.		
Kilcullihern, Female	3	87
Do. Male	—	145
Summerville	—	32
St. Patrick's, Female	4	193
Do. Male	—	195
Mount Sion	—	658
Killcoe	—	96
Faithleg	—	71
Ballygunner	—	177
Woodstown, Female	3	51
Do. Male	5	37
Drumrusk	—	132
Butlerstown	—	128
Kill	—	177
Newtown, Male	—	166
Do. Female	—	95
Dungarvan	—	536
Mount Barron	—	87
Lismore, Male	—	172
Do. Female	4	41
Tallow-free	—	229
Do. Female	—	276
Ballyduff	—	110
Castle Richard	—	117
Glendine	—	116
Theakincor	—	100

PROVINCE OF LEINSTER.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
CARLOW.		
Rathvilly	—	69
Do. Female	—	76
Hackistown	1	195
Tyneclash	—	137
Knockleshin	9	147
Tullow	—	337
Do. Female	—	260
Leighlinbridge	3	181
Tinryland	—	135
Do. Female	—	135
Carlow	—	252
Rathoe	—	66
Conaberry	9	127
Ballon	—	119
Myshall	7	109
Do. Male	—	103
Clonmore	—	90
Ridge	2	42
Killoughternau	52	—
Ballymartin	2	91
Do. Female	—	22
Ballinkillin	1	29
Newtown	—	106
Ballymurphy	—	121
Rahanna	—	161
Do. Female	—	87
Glynn	1	236
Do. Female	2	157
Drummond	—	127
Balanabrana	12	173
Do. Female	4	170
Newtown St. Mullin's	—	329
Borris	—	102
CARLOW—*continued.*		
Borris, Female	—	75
Clonegal	11	139
Kildavin	9	—
Do. Female	7	8
DUBLIN.		
Swords	5	99
St. Peter's	—	226
Richmond, Great	—	912
St. Michael and John's	—	260
Do. Female	—	240
St. Catherine's	—	300
Duplicate	—	179
Do.	—	240
St. James	2	152
Mendicity	7	330
Mill Street	1	711
St. James, Male	—	102
Dundrum, Male	—	76
Kingstown	—	128
Blackrock	—	114
Harold's Cross	—	110
Artane	—	70
Do. Male	—	62
Rahany, Male	—	90
Chapelirod	—	64
Do. Female	—	178
Lucan	—	112
Do. Female	—	94
Blancherstour	—	124
Do. Female	—	45
Mulhuddart	—	80
Do. Female	—	56

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
DUBLIN—*continued.*		
Lower Road	—	38
Dundrum, Female	2	121
Palmerstour	—	46
Do. Female	2	34
Finglass	—	49
Stillorgan	—	93
Dalkey	—	111
Do. Female	—	61
Clondalkin	—	52
Do. Male	—	126
Killossory	—	84
Malahide	1	24
Howth	2	63
Do. Female	3	63
Rush	5	138
Skerris	—	58
Do. Female	—	53
Ballymore	—	139
Do. Female	—	139
Baldoyle	—	119
Glaucullen	—	36
Garristown	2	54
Lusk	—	134
Saggard	—	71
KILDARE.		
Newtown	4	304
Eadestown	2	91
Halverstown	—	72
KILKENNY.		
Lisdowney	—	115
Chapel Lane	—	451
St. John	—	246
Bennetsbridge	—	93
Danesfort	—	102
Cloan	—	74
Do. Female	—	132
Urlingford	2	132
Castlecorner	—	271
Barnafea	1	170
Skoughvorteen	—	77
Goresbridge	—	76
Coppenna	4	148
Do. Female	—	125
Graig	—	285
Do. Female	—	234
Churchhill	—	133
Robinstown	3	138
Do. Female	—	60
Dunkit	—	175
Doning	—	88
Tubbernabrona	40	62
Rower	—	120
Callan	—	317
Presentation	—	669
Freshford	—	108
Do. Male	—	131
KING'S COUNTY.		
Tullamore	—	427
Tumbleston	—	49
Do. Male	—	87
Rahau	—	166
High Street	6	110
Banagher	—	64
Cloghan	—	144
Curgort	6	110
Killyon	6	75

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
KING'S COUNTY—*continued.*		
Kilmurry	6	102
Kanighill	—	196
Kilclonfert	4	214
Walsh Island	3	110
Clonbullock	1	109
Philipstown	—	145
Ballyboy	—	91
High Street	—	174
LOUTH.		
Ballymakenny	3	159
Hacketscross	—	97
Patrician	—	456
Termenfecken	—	170
Kellystown	—	161
Mill Duplicate	—	160
Tullyallen	—	111
Dunleer	—	180
Do. Female	—	216
Tenure	—	82
Dysart	4	179
Ferrardscross	2	178
Kilsaran	—	300
Dromisken	5	285
Kilcash	—	199
Mullagharlin	—	246
Darver	—	200
LONGFORD.		
Longford	—	85
Do. Female	—	94
Cooleeny	—	130
Granard	—	288
Killeen	3	112
Do. Female	—	103
Moyne	—	136
Cloonagh	—	150
Clonbrony	7	202
Balnalee	4	297
Carabeg	—	429
MEATH.		
Navan, Female	2	199
Ashbourne	—	103
Rathoath	—	120
Do. Female	—	105
Bellewstown	—	101
Clonalvy	—	123
Walterstown	—	93
Dangaw	—	171
Cannistown	—	72
Johnstown	2	166
Skreen	—	265
Killeen	—	154
Kildalkey	—	209
Fraine	—	107
Clonard	7	91
Do. Female	—	62
Knightstown	6	49
Do.	—	41
QUEEN'S COUNTY.		
Trumera	—	125
Reary	—	70
Balmakill, Female	—	280
Errill	—	88
Rathdowney	4	61
Do. Male	6	66

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
Queen's County–*continued.*		
Rathoniska	—	172
Mountmilleck	—	106
Do. Male	—	148
Portarlington	—	146
Do. Female	—	137
Ballyadams	1	152
Ballyfinn	17	109
Coote Street	—	194
Mountrath, Female	46	—
Clounaghadoe	75	3
Rushes	—	12
Coole Street, Female	—	116
Shauganamore	—	140
(Duplicate)	46	—
Graigne	—	50
Westmeath.		
Moate, Female	—	170
Mount Temple	2	48
Do. Male	—	111
Rochfordbridge	—	113
Kinnegad	8	108
Conalstown, Male	—	214
Moate, Male	—	94
Ballinvally	88	208
St. Mary's	6	156
Glaxtown	—	95
Wexford.		
Galbally	5	140
Do. Male	12	145
Barntown	—	107
Wexford–*continued.*		
Wexford	—	299
Castlebridge	—	196
Forth	—	82
Clearestown	—	88
Glynn	3	53
Maglass	4	140
Mulraukin	—	100
Mountfield	5	74
Cloncoach	18	89
Danescastle	—	86
Rathganogul	2	203
New Ross	—	210
Lady's Island	2	123
Wexford, Female	—	231
Heathfield	2	21
Gorey	1	206
New Ross	—	170
Ballykelly	—	102
Horsewood	—	224
Kilanaran	3	180
Do. Female	—	159
Kilmore	12	139
Wicklow.		
Baltinglass	—	170
Englishtown	5	26
Bombohall	—	30
Kilmacanogue	—	82
Bray, Female	—	123
Do. Male	—	166
Kilquiggau	1	65
Ballyconnell	4	10
Do. Female	5	141
Baltiboys	5	9

PROVINCE OF CONNAUGHT.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
Galway.		
Briarfield	—	65
Esker, Male and Female	—	335
Corofin	—	95
Shanballymore	2	171
Ower	—	7
Mount Bellew Bridge	2	133
Duniry	20	214
Woodford	18	408
Ballinakill	4	500
Tully	6	233
Roundstone	—	119
Ballinafad	—	90
Claddagh	—	158
Trie Hill	—	100
Galway, Male	4	1,069
Rahoon, Female	2	463
Bushy Park	—	85
Ballinasloe	—	114
Woodlawn	13	119
Moycullen	—	464
Gurrane	6	172
Leitrim.		
Towneyunsenagh	2	78
Leitrim	20	150
James Town, Male	—	140
Drumhall	—	63
Cratty	2	120
Lisduff	—	188
Derinkeher	9	164
Moheravogue	10	192
Leitrim—*continued.*		
Liscarban	14	170
Drumkeelanmore	3	113
Mohercreg, Female	2	90
Cordurry	20	100
Beaghmore	—	120
Kivey	10	60
Mayo.		
Kilmain	—	120
Ballygarris	3	117
Kilmore Enis	8	107
Clare Morris	6	132
Brackloon	—	104
Dugurt	—	54
Keel	—	90
Kildonet	—	37
Duiga	1	98
Ballinrobe	33	191
Lanmore	—	144
Aughagour	3	140
Cushen	1	90
Triangle	—	94
Westport, Male and Female	—	393
N. S. Pratt	—	144
Do. Female	—	136
Mollianey	—	73
Rossturk	—	86
Dunetrusk	—	84
Carracahowley	1	159
Letterlough	2	193

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.	Name of School.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
MAYO—*continued.*			ROSCOMMON.		
Tricubeg	—	118	Tarmon	—	48
Derralohau	—	136	Arm	—	124
Falldeef	—	88	Ballintleva	—	237
Tully	—	130	Dunamon	3	133
Louisburgh	1	115	Boyle, Male	—	377
Kill	—	191	Ballyfarnon	—	106
Tawnglass	—	132			
Deolin	—	101	SLIGO.		
Kenakellew	—	102			
Cloonlara	—	202	Templevancy	—	98
Deraheagh	—	80	Sligo, Male	—	336
Newfield	—	72	Rathcormick	8	73
Lisnaskea	6	57	Kilmorgan	8	103
Foxford	22	4	Little Bridge	1	99
Atty M. Hugh	1	130	Ballymote	—	93
Demicaracahil	—	221	Ballina, Female	—	160
Castlebar, Male	—	437	Barrada, Male	—	238

As the above Returns are not the Result of an official Inquiry instituted by the Board I cannot answer for their absolute Accuracy, I believe them, however, to be in the main correct, and to give a fair View of the proportional Numbers of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children attending the National School.

JAMES CARLILE.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Colonel WILLIAM WARRE is called in, and examined as follows: *Col. W. Warre.*

Did you by Order of the Government preside at the Investigation of certain Charges brought against the Military who were stationed in Carlow some Time in the Autumn of 1835?
I did.

Do you remember what was the general Result to which you came upon that Investigation, as to whether the Military were guilty or not guilty of the Charges advanced against them?
There was no legal Proof whatever against the Military.

Could you have come to that Conclusion if you had believed the Witnesses who deposed against them?
Certainly I think, if we could have believed the Witnesses, I should have come to a different Conclusion.

Were those Witnesses sworn or not?
They were all sworn.

Then did you come to the Conclusion that the Military were not guilty of the Offences charged on them, because you considered the Witnesses who swore against them to have sworn falsely?
There was so much Prevarication on the Part of some of the Witnesses, and others were of so disreputable a Character, that I could not attach much Belief to what they stated.

Did it appear in the course of the Investigation that any of the Witnesses whom you thought guilty of Prevarication, or otherwise to be unworthy of Credit, had been tampered with and induced to swear as they did by any Persons whatsoever?
I had no Means of ascertaining that.

Did any thing occur in the course of the Investigation that would lead to such a Conclusion?
I certainly recollect that Pains appeared to have been taken before in summoning those Witnesses to appear.

Col. W. Warre.

But merely in summoning them?
In summoning them to appear.

Then, to the best of your Recollection, you do not know that it appeared that any Exertions had been made with those Witnesses in telling them what they were to swear when they came?
I do recollect in One Instance that in the Examination of a Man of the Name of Patrick Nolan it appeared that what he was to state had been previously read to him.

Do you recollect whether it appeared by whom it had been previously read to him?
I think he was asked whether he had not had a Conversation with a Person of the Name of Gorman; first of all he prevaricated a good deal; he answered not; then he was pressed upon it, and asked whether he had not had a Paper read to him; and after some Time he acknowledged he had had a Paper read to him by Gorman, and that the Paper contained Questions very similar to those which he had been asked in Court. As well as I recollect from the hasty View which I took of the Minutes this Morning, that is what passed.

Do you recollect who Gorman was described to be?
He was the Chapel Schoolmaster, I think.

Did you hear whether that Chapel School was the National School?
No, I did not.

Did it appear that the Parish Priest Mahir had any thing to do in this Transaction with respect to the Preparation of this Witness?
If I recollect right, the Witness denied having seen Father Mahir.

Did it appear afterwards that he had seen Father Mahir, as far as you recollect?
No.

Were Father Mahir and Gorman the Schoolmaster present at this Investigation?
Father Mahir was constantly present; I do not recollect to have seen Gorman at all.

Independent of the Charges as far as respected this Witness, did any thing appear in the course of the Investigation which indicated any strong Hostility to Protestants on the Part either of Father Mahir or of Gorman the Schoolmaster?
I have no Recollection of Gorman being present at all; I do not recollect any strong Expressions of Animosity; I think there was generally during the whole Investigation a very strong Party Feeling on both Sides.

What was the general Result of the Investigation as reported by you to the Government?
The Result of the Report, which I can submit to your Lordships, was, that after having inquired into it we could find no legal Proofs so as to bring home to the Troops any actual Misconduct on the Part of Individuals, but that we had Reason to suspect that there had been considerable Indiscretion on the Part of the Troops, and sufficient to have given a Ground for the Complaints that had been made, but that those Complaints had not been substantiated.

Had you Occasion to see any thing of Mr. Carroll, the Editor of the Carlow Sentinel Newspaper, during the Investigation?
I do not know him by that Name. I think that either the Editor or Reporter of the Sentinel Newspaper was constantly present.

What was his Demeanor; was it marked by Violence, or was it peaceable?
I should say perfectly peaceable; I remember nothing to the contrary.

Had you any Communication with him?
With the Person that I suppose to be the Reporter I had occasional Communication, mere Matter of general Conversation.

Was it of such a Nature as to enable you to judge whether he was in a State of violent Excitement; did he seem a violent and heated Partizan?
I certainly thought him a very decided Partizan on his Side of the Question;

Col. W. Warre.

but as I of course, in the Situation in which I was placed, never entered into Conversation with him upon the Subject, I can say no further.

What was the Nature of the Complaint made against the Troops?
That they had used Language insulting to the Feelings of the Inhabitants by Allusions to their Religion, and that they had assembled in Public Houses and drank Orange Toasts, and expressing themselves against Popery.

What was the Nature of this Inquiry; what was the Court over which you presided?
It was called a Commission. I was ordered to go with a Mr. Maloney, a Magistrate, and to inquire fully into the Circumstances by hearing both Sides of the Question. I considered it as rather a Commission of Inquiry than a Court.

Do you recollect whether you saw the Report in the Carlow Sentinel of the Evidence taken before you?
Yes, I did, constantly.

Did that Report appear to you fair and correct, as far as you recollect?
I think, as far as a Newspaper Report is generally correct, it was so; I think, considering all Things, it was a fair Statement, considering the Bias he had, but still not a true one.

Mr. Carroll's Demeanor you say was peaceable; I suppose if he had not been peaceable you would have put him out of the Court?
I do not know as to taking so strong a Measure as that; I should have pointed out to him where he was wrong.

You said that it appeared from a Witness called Nolan that there had been read over to him what he was to answer to certain Questions?
From a written Paper.

On whose Evidence did it appear?
On the Cross-examination of Nolan himself.

Was Nolan himself one of those Witnesses that you described as being very disreputable?
I should be fearful to give a positive Answer to that Question, for only at Eleven o'Clock To-day I received the Minutes from the Country, which are very voluminous; I was obliged to cast my Eye very hastily over them; if your Lordships will permit me to appear before you again, I should then be better informed.

Have you any Recollection whether he was one of the Witnesses that prevaricated?
I have a strong Recollection that he was by no means a creditable Witness.

Is your Recollection confident that it was upon the Cross-examination that his having had this Paper read to him came out?
Certainly. I remember the previous Circumstance, that he was asked whether he had any Conversation with Mr. Fitzgerald or Mr. Mahir; he answered not, and that he was a very unwilling Witness, and at last it was elicited from him that the Evidence he was to give had been read to him from a Paper; and then he was asked whether it was Gorman, and he said he did not know. "But you must know whether it is Gorman or not?" He said he did not know him by Name, he only knew him by Sight. Then he was asked, "Was he the Chapel Schoolmaster?" and after some Time, with a good deal of Difficulty, he admitted that he was the Chapel Schoolmaster, and that his Children went to the School to say Catechism, and that he had known Gorman for a Year, though he did not recollect his Name. Those Things I now recollect, and they were got out by Cross-examination.

The Notes that you allude to, were they taken by yourself or by any other Person?
Part written by myself, and Part written by a Short-hand Writer. We applied for a Short-hand Writer at the Beginning of the Business. The Short-hand

Col. W. Warre.

Writer quite lost his Head, and he called out in the Middle of the Court, "Father Mahir! Father Mahir!" and rushed out of Court. After that I could not allow him to take any more Minutes, and I was obliged to take the Minutes myself as far as I could. Afterwards I employed a Man to do it.

During the Course of the Inquiry do you recollect that the Excitement that prevailed manifested itself in any Act of Impropriety or Violence actually committed in the Court from any Quarter?

No. I was obliged from the very Beginning to put a stop to any Sort of Altercation or Recrimination between the Parties, and I recollect the very first Day I was in Court that an Attempt was made of that Kind,—I do not recollect by whom,—and I insisted upon it that they should only answer Questions which they were asked, and that I would not permit any Person to be addressing from the one Side of the Court to the other.

And after that no gross Impropriety occurred?

Certainly Impropriety did occur, because towards the Conclusion of the Business I found it necessary to express my Opinion very strongly to Father Mahir of his Conduct.

What had been the Conduct of Father Mahir which you felt it your Duty to reprimand?

I was taken extremely ill, and obliged to leave the Court, and after I left the Court he made some Remarks extremely insulting to me. I think the Expression, was that he had blown up One Court of Inquiry, and, please God, he would blow this up too; something exceedingly uncivil, particularly as he had been treated with a great deal of Civility and Forbearance, I thought.

You did not hear it yourself?

I did not, but it was communicated to me immediately afterwards.

Did you tell Father Mahir that this had been communicated to you?

It was not my Intention to have noticed it at all; but, however, he provoked it by something that passed subsequently, and then I did tell Father Mahir what my Opinion was.

Do you recollect whether Father Mahir was disrespectful in his Manner at the Time that you thought it necessary to reprimand him?

Certainly not disrespectful in his Manner to me, because it was reported to me as having occurred after I left the Court.

Was it in open Court that you found it necessary to reprimand him?

It was.

What was his Conduct on receiving that Reprimand?

I think I never saw a Man so much taken aback at any thing; he seemed quite surprised that any Man should address him in the Manner I did, but he was not disrespectful. He endeavoured to deny that he had used the Terms attributed to him, but I told him there was no use in denying it, there was abundant Evidence to prove it in Court, and there the Thing dropped.

Do you remember whether the Short-hand Writer, whom you stated to have lost his Head, and to have gone out of Court crying "Father Mahir! Father Mahir!" was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?

He was a Roman Catholic, but I believe him to have been in a State of such violent nervous Excitement that he did not know what he was saying.

The Occasion of the Commission being appointed at Carlow was from the very great Excitement in the Town?

It was.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. THOMAS HARRIS CARROLL is called in, and further examined as follows: *Mr. T. H. Carroll*

Have you ever at any Time heard Mr. Mahir use Language of a violent Character against Protestants?
I have.

Will you state any Particulars that occur to you?
This Extract I now hold in my Hand is at the Conclusion of One of his Speeches.

On what Occasion?
On the Occasion of a public Election in the Presence of the Gentry of the County.

At what Time?
In 1832, in the Month of January.

Were you present?
I was.

You seem to have a Note in your Hand; did you make that Note at the Time?
I did, upon the Spot, in the Presence of the High Sheriff and the Assessor. "We will take our Stand here daily as Priests, and we will mark the Traitors who will vote against us; yes, we shall mark even to the Grave the Traitor who will vote against his Religion and Country;" that was the Conclusion of his Speech, upon which Occasion the greatest Confusion took place, and he left the Court. He subsequently returned into the Court and attempted to explain his own Expressions, and it appeared that he would not be admitted. Upon that Occasion Mr. Tomb the Assessor declared he would commit him if he made use of such Language again during the Election.

Was this at Carlow?
It was.

Have you any other Instance of violent Language used against Protestants?
I have here his last Speech at the Election in February 1837. I should have observed, that in 1835 Mr. Mahir went about the Town with a large Concourse of Persons, and he called upon the Electors to vote for him, and upon that Occasion those Protestants that refused had their Windows broken by the Mob which accompanied him.

Did you hear him tell the People to do that?
I heard him make use of one Expression to one Person, that the Grass should grow at his Door if he did not vote for him.

Did he order the Houses of the Protestants that did not vote as he wished to be broken into?
I did not hear him say so, nor do I believe that he gave those Orders, but I know that the Mob broke into their Windows.

You say he ordered them to vote for him;—for whom?
For the Parties that he recommended to the County.

Did you hear him?
I did. I accompanied him upon that Occasion with a few Persons, and my Object in so doing was to protect the Houses of a few Friends.

Were any of those Protestants to whom he addressed this?
Yes.

Was it a Protestant to whom he addresed that Declaration, that "the Grass should grow at his Door"?
That was to a Roman Catholic.

What did you understand by that Phrase of the "Grass growing at his Door"?
I understood from that, that if the Man named Butler did not vote for the popular Candidates his Business would be destroyed, and accordingly his Business is destroyed—he is now a Bankrupt.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

What was his Business?
A Woollen Draper.

Have you any other Case of violent Language?
I have; of this Speech I have the Short-hand Notes at my Lodgings, but this is the Report copied from my own Notes.

Did you hear the Speech?
I did.

Is that Copy you have in your Hand a Copy made out from your Short-hand Notes which you took at the Time when you heard the Speech?
It is.

When did you compare it?
I compared it after Publication and before Publication, and I even compared my Notes with the Report since I came to Town.

Will you read what you have?
He said, "The present Election was the Struggle of the few to lord it over the many; it was the last Struggle for the last Fragment of Protestant Ascendancy. Would the Catholics forget the Penal Laws? Would they forget that it was a Crime for one of them to keep a Horse worth more than *5l.*? Education was proscribed;—the Priests were hunted into Caverns! It was true that Christianity disavowed this Tyranny, but the Aristocracy upheld those Laws. With Liberty on their Lips, a miserable Minority monopolized every thing, and enacted Laws to grind them into Dust. For example, they made a Law which compelled them to support another Church; and who supported that Law? That miserable Segment of Aristocracy they had before them that Day. The People demanded Vote by Ballot, Abolition of Tithes, Destruction of Corporate Monopoly, but they did not want an Ascendancy nor a Superiority to which they were not entitled; but without a fair Share of the Privileges of the State the People would not nor should not be satisfied. You denounce Agitation: I say the Agitators are that miserable Segment of Aristocracy who oppose the People's Wishes. Who are now the Agitators? The criminal Agitators are the Aristocracy. Who would not prefer to be in the Ranks of the People of former Days than be in the Ranks of Tyrant Persecutors whose Names have gone down to Posterity execrated for their Villany and Bloodthirstiness." "He asked the Freeholders, would they stand by the People, or with the miserable, monopolizing, bloodthirsty Aristocracy which opposed them? Mr. Vigors stood among the People, where he found Virtue and Talent. No Vote should be given to the vile, persecuting, tyrannical Landlords of the County, the bloody Tories of Carlow. Mr. Bunbury was supported by that Church which is stained with Blood, and gathers her Plunder covered with the Maledictions of the People; he was supported by the Rebellion Ruffians, by the Tithe Proctors, and the ferocious Bigots of the Land."

Can you find any Part in which he urges the People or endeavours to intimidate the Protestants from sending their Children to the School?
I think this Passage bears upon it: "That in 1746 the Protestants were to the Roman Catholics as One to Three; now they were only as One to Ten, and by and by they would vanish altogether."

What was the Religion of the Two Candidates for the Representation of Carlow?
The Religion of the Two Candidates was Protestant, as far as I know Mr. Vigors's Principles.

Both Protestants?
Both Protestants.

You have said that you have interested yourself much in respect to the Education of the Poor of Carlow, and you were understood to say that you knew that there were as many as 150 poor Protestant Children who need Education?
I have examined my Notes very minutely from the Returns of those Schools, and I find that there are 150 poor Children in Carlow; and I find, owing to a

Decrease of the Funds of the Carlow Schools, there are about Fifty poor Children without Education at all. *Mr. T. H. Carroll*

What Carlow Schools do you mean?
I mean the Schools supported by voluntary Subscriptions.

The Protestant or Roman Catholic?
The Protestant.

Do those Fifty Children need gratuitous Instruction?
They do.

Do they go to the National School?
Not One.

Do you know any Reason why they do not go there?
The only Reason I can draw is by Inference from the Conduct of Mr. Mahir and the Priests, and the general Conduct of Gorman the Schoolmaster.

You conclude that that is the Cause of their not going to the School?
I do; that is my own positive Opinion.

What are the Grounds of that Opinion?
I will state the Grounds. From the strong Feeling which the Protestants of the Town of Carlow entertain against those Persons who have abused them at public Meetings, and have done so in the public Papers, and that bad Feeling I consider to be engendered in consequence of those Speeches and those Writings in the public Newspapers against their Religion.

You were understood to say that those Children have ceased to go to the Carlow Schools in consequence of the falling off of the Funds of the Schools?
I did not state that.

Did not you state that you examined the Returns of certain Carlow Schools, and that 150 Children used to attend those Schools, and that Fifty out of those 150 now have no Means of Education whatever?
What I have stated I believe is this,—that there are 150 poor Children in the Town of Carlow, and that there are Fifty Children without Education at all in consequence of the Want of Funds for those Institutions.

What are those Schools that you referred to just now, which you have examined the Returns of?
The Protestant daily public Schools.

Were those the Schools with respect to which you said the Funds have fallen off of late?
Yes.

By whom were those Schools supported?
One of the Schools was formerly under the Patronage of the Kildare Street Society, and since those Funds have been withdrawn from it they have been solely supported by voluntary Contribution and annual Charity Sermons.

Has the Amount of voluntary Contributions and of the Produce of Sermons diminished?
Very much.

By whom were those Contributions made?
By Protestant Individuals.

Who attended those Sermons in general; were they Protestant Sermons?
Protestant Sermons preached in the Parish Church.

And the Supply from those Quarters has diminished?
It has.

Does that relate to all the Carlow Protestant Schools, or only to One?
All those Schools are under the same Roof; there is an Infant School, there is a Workhouse for giving Work to industrious young Females, and a Day School, and a Female School for Adults.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Were the Funds that supported all those Schools a Fund common to them all?

Yes; at present, the Profits of the Work performed in the Institution assist also; but that is very precarious at present.

Has the Number of Protestants in Carlow diminished?

No; I think they have increased considerably within a few Years.

Has the Opulence of the Protestant Inhabitants of Carlow diminished?

I think Trade has considerably declined; I never knew Carlow in such a State of Bankruptcy as at present.

How long is it since it began declining?

Within the last Year and a Half, or Two Years.

Do you attribute the Diminution of the Funds of those Schools, independently of what was appropriated by the Kildare Street Society, to the Declension of the Trade in Carlow?

I do.

Did Gorman the Schoolmaster attend at the Examination or Military Inquiry; did you see him there on every Day or on most Days during the Inquiry?

I saw him mostly every Day during the entire Inquiry.

How long did the Inquiry last?

It lasted about Thirteen Days.

Do you know of your own Knowledge that Gorman has been absent from the School on other Business at other Times which were not during Holidays?

Yes.

At what Times and on what Occasions?

During the entire of the late Assizes of Carlow and the entire Sessions, as Political Trials were under Consideration.

How long did the Assizes last?

It lasted for Three Days and a Half.

How long did the Sessions last?

About Five Days.

Were you there the whole Time?

I was.

Was he a Witness on any Trial?

He was not to my Knowledge.

Are you aware of any Cause that existed to bring him there?

There were Tithe Trials which excited great Interest, Tithe Trials, Rescues of Cattle, and Registries.

Do you know of your own Knowledge, or have you any Reason to suppose, that he went to those Assizes or Sessions for any special Purpose?

Not for any special Purpose that I am aware of.

Will you upon your Oath say that he was not summoned to attend those Assizes as a Juror?

I will, upon my Oath, say that he was not, because he is not qualified to be a Juror.

Will you, upon your Oath, state that he was not subpœnaed to attend any Trial?

I cannot swear that he was not subpœnaed, but I will swear to the best of my Belief that he was not subpœnaed.

Will you swear that he was not subpœnaed to give Evidence at any Trial?

I will not.

Have

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Have you any Reason to suppose that he was subpœnaed?
I have not the slightest.

Was not there great Excitement at the Carlow Election in 1832?
There was.

Was not there great Excitement by both Parties?
Yes, there was.

And violent Language made use of?
No, not by one Party.

No violent Language made use of excepting by this one Individual?
Not any unconstitutional Language made use of during the entire Election, but by him and another Priest.

What is unconstitutional Language?
Language derogatory to what I conceive to be the Laws of the Country, and leading to a Breach of the Peace.

Have you not generally, when you have been present at Elections in Ireland, seen a great deal of Heat and a great deal of violent Language between the Partizans of each Candidate?
I have.

Is it not the Habit at Carlow for People to show a great deal more Violence upon the Hustings at a contested Election than perhaps they might do in their cooler Moments?
It is usual.

Was there nothing occurred at that Election tending to a Breach of the Peace?
There was upon that Occasion.

Was there nothing on the opposite Side also?
Not in 1832.

In 1835?
I do not recollect that there was any thing on the Part of the Protestants.

Do you recollect the Arrival of any Body of Gentlemen from a different Part of the County, that tended to a Breach of the Peace?
I do; it took place at the Boundary of the Borough of Carlow. I had not the Means of seeing it.

Did not it take place within that Part of the Town of Carlow which was under the Jurisdiction of the Chief Officers of Police at the Time?
Of course it did.

Did you witness it?
I did not.

You say that the Number of Children gaining the Advantage of the Protestant Schools has been diminished in consequence of the Want of Funds. Do you know any Funds belonging to the Town or the People of Carlow that could be applied to Public Schools in addition to any Collections that might be made at Charity Sermons?
I do not.

Were there no Lands belonging to the Corporation of Carlow that might be applied for that Purpose?
The Corporation of Carlow never possessed One Acre of Land to my Knowledge.

Did they not at one Time enjoy Funds for that Purpose?
No, they did not. I should observe, that the only Profits of the Corporation have been derived from Tolls and Customs, and those Tolls and Customs were abolished a few Years ago by Mob Law. They have no Fees whatever now.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Are you a Member of the Corporation?
I am not.

Did any Protestant Parent of any of those Fifty Children that you saw destitute of Education ever tell you that they did not send their Children to the National School in consequence of the Conduct of any Individual?
They did not; but I know most, if not all the Protestants, come into contact with them frequently.

And not One of them ever stated to you that he did not send his Children to the School in consequence of the Conduct of any Individual?
No; but they complained to me of the Want of Means to procure them Clothing, or to procure them Books to send them to the Public Day Schools which I referred to. I was aware that they would not send them to the National School.

Did they deal with the Matter as if it was out of the Question their going to the National School?
They did.

But still, in your intimate Acquaintance with those People, you do not remember any One Case in which an Individual said he did not send his Children to the National School in consequence of the Conduct of any other Individual?
I do not.

You say that they dealt with the Matter as if it was quite out of the Question that they should send their Children to the National School; what did they say or do which justifies you in stating that they dealt with the Matter in that Way?
I am aware of the Feelings which those People entertain towards the Persons who conduct the National School and the Managers of it, and I am equally well aware that no Protestant would send his Children to the School.

You were asked whether they did not deal with the Matter as if it was quite out of the Question, and you said yes. Now what was said or done to justify you in saying that they dealt with the Matter as if it was quite out of the Question?
When I stated that of course it was out of the Question I meant to convey to this Committee that such was the general Conduct both of the Masters and the Managers of the National School upon all public Occasions, at public Meetings, and in Sermons which have been reported to have been delivered from the Altar, that under the Circumstances it was out of the Question that Protestants would send their Children to those Schools, in my Opinion.

Would you as a Protestant, if you were in the Situation of one of those poor Men, send your Children to a School where the Manager was a Man who denounced your Religion and the Religious Establishment of your Persuasion?
I would not.

Can you swear that there is not One Protestant Child at that School?
I believe I can safely swear it; I will not positively swear that there might not be a Protestant since I left Carlow.

Do you often go to the School?
I have visited it twice, and upon one Occasion the Master told me that there was not a Protestant in the School.

When was it that you visited it?
It was on the 14th of March.

You said you had visited it twice; when was the former Time?
The former Period was about Eight Months before.

Was there any Protestant Child there then?
Not to my Knowledge.

Do you know that there was not?
I believe there was not.

Did you ask?
I do not recollect that I asked; but I am almost certain that there was not.

Are the Committee to understand that your Objection to sending your Children to the National School would arise from the Conduct of Father Mahir, not from any of the Regulations of the National Board of Education of Ireland?
I did not state that; I would have another Objection if I had Children of my own.

But what would be the great Objection?
I would not send my Children to any School where they were not allowed to read the Scriptures freely, and make the Scriptures the Basis of Moral Instruction.

And it is on account of that Opinion, that the Scriptures are not allowed to be read, that you would not send your Children?
That is one Reason, and an important one.

The other Reason is the Violence of Father Mahir and the Priests?
Yes, and of the Schoolmaster.

Then if the Schoolmaster had not been violent, nor Father Mahir, should you or should you not object to send your Children to a School in connexion with the National Board of Education?
I would, for the Reasons I have stated.

There are some Protestant Clergy resident in Carlow?
There are.

Have they ever expressed any great Disapprobation of the National Board of Education?
I have frequently conversed with the Reverend Mr. Jamieson the Rector and others.

Has he expressed any Disapprobation?
He has, frequently.

Has he ever preached against it?
Never to my Knowledge.

Nor any other Person?
I never heard a Protestant Clergyman preach against it.

Has he endeavoured to discourage Children from going to the School?
I am aware that if they went there he would prefer their going to his own; I am not aware that he ever discouraged them, or had any Occasion to do so.

But he has expressed great Disapprobation of the Plan?
He has.

In private Conversation?
In private Conversation.

The Protestant Clergy have a School in Carlow?
They have; it is a School principally supported, not under their Patronage, but under that of a Committee of many Gentlemen and Ladies.

Why do not those Fifty Children who you say are without Education go to it?
In the first place, the School is very badly prepared for Want of Books, and the Children are very poor; if they went to the School there is not even Accommodation, for they have been obliged to turn a Part of the School into a Place for Workwomen—to give out Work to Females, and that Accom-

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

modation which was formerly given to the Children is not now in the Carlow School from Want of Funds.

You mean that there is not literally Room?
The Place that used to be appropriated is now, a Portion of it, appropriated to working, and the Children are badly clad for Want of Funds. I think that is one great Reason they cannot go to the School.

Have you any Children of your own?
I have not.

Have you often visited the Carlow Protestant School?
I have, very frequently.

How much of the Scripture is read there?
The New Testament is of course read by the Class which is capable of reading.

How often?
I believe the head Class reads once a Day.

How much do they read every Day?
I think a Chapter; some Days Two Chapters.

What Days?
I think that would depend principally upon the Length of the Chapter; if it is a very short one, they may read Two.

Is there no Rule about their reading the New Testament?
There are Rules which prescribe to read the New Testament every Day.

With respect to the Old Testament, when do they read that?
I cannot say what Time they read the Old Testament.

Do you know that they ever read it?
I could not take upon myself to swear that they do, but I believe that they do; but as to the New Testament, I can say positively, because I saw them read it.

That would make about Six Chapters a Week of the New Testament?
They read also on Sundays; there is a Sunday School.

The School meets every Day?
Every Day.

Supposing that One Day was set apart for the Boys of this or of any other School solely for the reading of the New Testament, might not as much or more of the New Testament be read in about Three Hours as is read, according to the present System, in the whole Six Days, which is Six Chapters?
It would depend upon Circumstances.

It does not take Half an Hour to read a Chapter in the New Testament, does it?
I think to read it with Profit, perhaps it may be better to read it slowly. On Sunday the Scriptures are lectured upon; they are explained by the Sunday School Teachers, and One Chapter may occupy as much Time in that Way as reading Six Chapters would without being commented upon.

On Sunday it is explained, but not on the other Days?
Yes.

The former Question referred to the Six Days of the Week, and not to the Explanation upon the Sundays; but as far as merely reading went, might not as much be read in One Day set apart for that alone, by the reading Class, as is now read in the whole of the Six Days?
I think it might, but I do not believe it would be attended with so much Profit.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

And then it might be just as well explained upon the Sunday as it is now?
I can only give my Opinion. I think the Class reading daily a Chapter, and reading it attentively, would profit more by that Mode than if they read continuously for Three Hours Six or Seven Chapters in One Day. I think it would make a greater Impression on the Minds of Youth.

You think Three Hours given One Day in the Week to the Study of Divinity would not produce so great a Knowledge of it in the Student as if he divided the same Amount of Time over Six Days a Week?
I do not say that; I draw a great Distinction between a little Boy and a Student of Divinity. I know that a Student of Divinity could read continuously with Profit, and that it may have a greater Effect upon him to study for Three Hours than for One every Day; but I am aware that it would not do so well for a little Boy. My own Opinion is, that it would be better suited to their Capacities to read One Chapter, and do that frequently.

But in the Protestant School the only Explanation that takes place is upon Sunday?
Yes; that is the Fact, so far as I am aware of.

Prior to the Establishment of the National Schools do you know how the Catholic Population were educated?
I do; so far as I could collect in that Part of the Country, a great many of them attended the Kildare Street Society Schools in Carlow, and at present in the Vicinity of Carlow they attend the Kildare Street Schools.

How many Schools were there in Carlow connected with the Kildare Place Society?
A Male School, a Female School, and an Infant School; they were under One Roof; those are the only Schools that I am aware of in connexion with the Kildare Street Society.

Do you know how many Children received Education at that Period?
I could not exactly say; I will state why. Before the National Board System was adopted the present School connected with the National Board in Carlow was in existence, and was supported voluntarily by both Protestants and Roman Catholics. At the Request of Dr. Doyle, who was much respected in the Country some Years past, I had once subscribed myself to it, and many Protestants of the Town had subscribed to the School during that Period, and when the National Board was established I had very little Knowledge with it afterwards.

At the Time it was supported by the Subscription both of Protestants and Roman Catholics did any Protestant Child attend that School?
Never to my Knowledge, because they had a School of their own.

You say that the Roman Catholic Children attended the Schools under the Kildare Street Society; were there more Roman Catholic Children at those Schools than Protestant, or not?
In Carlow there are more Protestants; but in the immediate Vicinity, the Graigue School for instance, there are more Roman Catholics even now within less than a Quarter of a Mile of Carlow.

Were the Children of the Roman Catholics withdrawn from that School?
They have frequently been compelled to leave the School, but they return again.

How were they compelled?
By the Roman Catholic Clergyman of the Parish; I am speaking now of the Graigue Schools.

Do you know that Gorman the Schoolmaster has been employed at any Time at Elections in any Capacity which must have taken him from Attendance on the School?
I have seen him employed as Poll Clerk.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

For many Days together?
During an entire Election.

How many Days?
Perhaps Six Days.

When was this?
In the present Year.

In what Month?
In February.

Was that during the Christmas Holidays?
No.

Is it not generally the Custom to employ Schoolmasters as Poll Clerks?
I have been at various Elections, and I never knew an Instance of it.

Do you mean to say that there were no Schoolmasters employed as Poll Clerks at the Elections?
No, I could not swear it, but I am not aware of it.

In point of fact, you saw this National Schoolmaster, not during the Time of the Vacations allowed by the National Board, so employed for several Days?
I did.

You said that the Roman Catholic Priest used Means to prevent Catholic Children from attending the Kildare Street Schools in the Town of Graigue; do you know what those Means were?
I have heard what they were from a Roman Catholic Gentleman who was present, and who stated it to me. In the Town of Graigue, when I visited the National School, I found but Nineteen Roman Catholic Children; in the same Village of Graigue I found in the Male School Twenty-nine Roman Catholics and Thirty-six Protestants, altogether in the Male School Sixty-five; and I found in going to the other School under the same Roof Forty-six Roman Catholics and only Twenty-six Protestants, making in the Female School Seventy-two. These Schools are under the Management of the Protestant Curate Mr. O'Connor and some Ladies in Graigue.

What Means did the Roman Catholic Clergymen take to induce those Roman Catholic Children to withdraw from those Schools?
I have been informed that he spoke of them publicly from the Altar, and even horsewhipped some of the Children in their Way from the School.

From whom was your Information derived?
From a respectable Roman Catholic Gentleman, a Mr. Dowling, a Parishioner of Mr. Rafter, the Parish Priest of Graigue. He told me that he heard him preach frequently against the Children attending the Schools under the Kildare Street Society, and also that he heard of those Children being frequently beaten with a Horsewhip from the School. On visiting the School I inquired of the Visitor the Reverend Mr. O'Connor, and of the Master and Mistress, and they declared the same.

Beaten with a Horsewhip! by whom and when?
Near the School, by the Reverend Mr. Rafter.

You said that the Children afterwards returned?
They did; I saw the Children there myself.

Those who had formerly been induced to withdraw?
They did withdraw for a few Days, but they invariably returned back again.

Do they continue there still?
They do.

Are they horsewhipped now in their Way to School?
Not to my Knowledge.

519

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

This Gentleman did not lay an Information before the Magistrates of Persons having met Children in the Highway and flogged them?

It is not usual to do so; he did not to my Knowledge; I am aware that he is a Man of considerable Stake in the Country, and he would have had no Hesitation in proving the Fact.

Is he a Magistrate?

He is not; he is a Roman Catholic Trader of Respectability, and Brother to a Roman Catholic Priest.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 1° *Maii* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Col. W. Warre.

Colonel WILLIAM WARRE is called in, and further examined as follows:

Have you had an Opportunity, since you were here before, of looking at the Report which you made upon the Inquiry into the Conduct of the Military at Carlow?

I have.

What is the Result, as far as respects Father Mahir and Gorman the Schoolmaster; did it appear to you that they were implicated in undue Practices on that Occasion?

I can hardly speak decidedly as to Gorman; on Two Occasions it appeared that he had been examining Witnesses before they were brought up, but only on Two Occasions, so far as my Minutes show. Then with regard to Father Mahir, it certainly appeared that he was very active in bringing forward the whole of the Complaint; that he was instrumental in getting Signatures to the Complaint, and that during the Time when the Complaint was investigated he took an active Part in conducting the Prosecution.

But though an active Part, not an unfair Part?

Certainly not an unfair Part, having once undertaken it.

You saw no Misconduct on the Part of Gorman?

I never saw him myself, to my Knowledge; and all I know is, that in one Instance he read out the Evidence that Pat. Nolan was to give, and in another Instance he went and called a Man of the Name of Purcell, a Pensioner, to come and give Evidence.

Then it is hardly necessary to ask whether there was any such Misconduct on his Part as induced you to make a Report either to the Government or to the Board of Education respecting him?

I made no Report respecting him; I certainly think that Father Mahir gave us a great deal more Trouble than was necessary in this respect; that he at one Time denied having taken a leading Part in this Prosecution, which in fact he had done.

You are not aware that any Report was made upon the Schoolmaster's Conduct to Government?

None.

Did you visit the School?

I did not; I avoided taking any Part in any thing of a local Nature.

Do you wish to make any Explanation of any Part of your former Evidence?

I wish to explain a Part of the Evidence I gave on a former Day, where I alluded to a Watch having been stolen. Now, on looking at the Minutes, I find that it was not Pat. Nolan to whom that applied; there were Two Nolans examined, and nothing of that Sort was proved against Pat. Nolan.

During the Course of this Investigation do you recollect that any Witness stated upon that Occasion that it had been dictated to him by Gorman what his Evidence was to be?

Not exactly that the Evidence had been dictated to him; but Pat. Nolan was asked whether any Person had read to him from a Paper the Evidence he was to give that Day; he hesitated for some Time to acknowledge it; at last he acknowledged that the Paper had been read to him; and they asked him by whom; he said he did not know the Person's Name; they pressed him to

Col. W. Warre.

know whether it was Gorman the Chapel Schoolmaster, and he admitted that it was; and they asked him what was the Nature of the Questions, precisely as I stated before; and there was One other Instance, and only One other Instance, and that was a Man of the Name of Purcell, a Pensioner, who, when asked who had gone for him, said that Gorman had gone for him, and brought him down.

Did you consider that that Circumstance tended to lessen the Value of the Evidence of those Persons?

Certainly not; Gorman's Name and many other Names were frequently mentioned during the Inquiry, and Questions were asked as to who had brought them down, who had examined them, and so on; and I always objected to that upon the Ground that I thought it very natural that when People had to bring forward Evidence to prove a Case they should ask the Witnesses previously what they had to say. As our Time was very much lengthened out I did object to those Questions being put, and I recollected that Gorman's Name was mentioned along with others.

Did it occur to you that there was any Degree of Culpability or Impropriety on the Part of Gorman arising from this Circumstance?

No.

Mr. H. Malcomson.

Mr. HENRY MALCOMSON is called in, and examined as follows:

You reside in Carlow?

I do.

You are an Apothecary?

I am a Licentiate Apothecary.

Are you also the chief Proprietor of a Newspaper?

I am the Proprietor.

What is the Name of that Newspaper?

The Carlow Sentinel.

Had you occasion at the Time of the Military Investigation to go to the National School while that Investigation was going on?

I did not, at that Time.

Did you ever go there and find it closed?

I did.

On ordinary School Days?

On the 30th of March in this Year I visited that School, and found it shut.

Do you know why it was shut?

I do not.

What Day of the Week was this?

I do not recollect; it was not a Sunday.

Are you aware whether it was a Holiday of such a Description as is usually kept in Ireland?

I presume not; for all the Shops of the Town were open that Day, and Business going on as usual.

Do you know a Person named Catharine Bradley?

I do.

Is she now in Ireland?

She went to Van Diemen's Land.

Do you know why she went?

She told me, and I had Reason to believe what she told me, that she was obliged to leave Carlow, in consequence of the Persecutions that she underwent.

Did she tell you what was the Kind of Persecution which she underwent?

She was persecuted for being a Protestant.

Was she a married Woman?
An unmarried Woman.

By whom did she say she was persecuted?
By Father Mahir's Followers, as she called them.

Did she say she was persecuted by Father Mahir himself?
Frequently spoken to by Father Mahir himself to become a Roman Catholic.

Had she ever been a Roman Catholic?
I believe not; I heard her often say she never was.

Or her Family?
Her Father was a Protestant, and her Mother was a Protestant; but after the Demise of her Father, I believe about Two Years after, her Mother became a Roman Catholic.

Did she state that she was in great Terror in Carlow?
Very great; I know myself that she was obliged to take refuge for Three Nights in the Police Barrack.

In consequence of the Persecution she met with from whom?
From Persons of the lower Order in Carlow.

Did she say that Father Mahir himself had threatened her in any way?
I cannot say threatened her, but made use of Language to induce her to become a Roman Catholic.

What did she say that he said?
She said that Father Mahir mentioned to her that she was going to Van Diemen's Land, and if she would not become a Roman Catholic that the Probability was that the Ship that she sailed in might go down, and if it went down her Soul would be damned; and that no Protestant would see the Light of Heaven. I heard her say that he made use of those Expressions.

You say she was in a State of great Terror?
Yes. She came to my House for Money to pay for Lodging in consequence of her being turned out of her Lodging, and I gave her Money for the Purpose.

Who turned her out of her Lodging?
The Persons with whom she was lodging.

Was it Father Mahir?
She told me Persons under his Influence, and I believe it was so.

What Sort of Influence was it that he exerted over them to induce them to turn her out?
The Influence that a Priest has over the Members of his Flock.

Knowing, as you do, the Sort of Conduct which has been going on on the Part of Father Mahir and others, if you were a poor Protestant, would you permit your Child to go to a School under his Management?
Certainly not.

You said she was obliged to sleep Three Nights in the Police Barrack. What was the Nature of the Persecution which obliged her to do that?
She was turned out of her Lodging at the Hour of Eleven o'Clock at Night.

Who were the People that turned her out?
The People that had the Lodging in which she resided.

Had she paid her Rent?
I am sure that was not the Cause; because she told me the Cause of it.

But your Knowledge is only from what she told you?
It was a Thing generally known in the Town.

Your particular Knowledge came from her?
From her.

Mr. H. Malcomson.

And you know nothing more about it than what she told you?
I heard of it repeatedly from others; and there is a Medical Man who has seen her in the Police Barrack himself.

Was it Matter of public Notoriety?
It was. Dr. Bolton had seen her in the Barrack.

Why was she turned out of her Lodging?
Because she would not become a Roman Catholic, and conform to the Views of Father Mahir.

Are all Protestants who will not conform to the Roman Catholic Doctrine turned out of their Lodgings in Carlow?
I know a Person that has been sent out of the Town. Father Mahir took a Dislike to a Person of the Name of Bridget M'Carthy.

You mentioned some Language that Father Mahir used about the Ship going to the Bottom; was that the Inducement he held out to her to go to Van Diemen's Land?
Quite the reverse.

But she did go?
She did; she could not live in Carlow.

You said that you would not let your Children go to a School managed by Father Mahir. Would you let your Children go to a School under the National Board under any Circumstances?
I think I would, if I knew the Character of the Master and Visitor. I might, if I had no other Alternative.

Do you understand the Regulations established by the Board of Education?
No, I do not. I never made any Inquiries or took any Pains to get Information upon the Subject.

The Reason that would prevent you from sending your Children to a School under Father Mahir was, because you considered him to show so much Violence towards Protestants?
Decidedly.

Did you advise that Woman to take any particular Step in consequence of the Communication she made to you?
I advised her to make an Affidavit of it, which I have here.

Had her Mother turned Roman Catholic before this?
Yes, she had.

Did her Mother turn Roman Catholic in consequence of marrying a Roman Catholic?
No; her late Husband was a Protestant.

Did she marry again?
No, she did not; but she lived in a Roman Catholic House.

Do you know any similar Persecution of any other Protestant in the Neighbourhood?
I cannot charge my Memory with any.

Have you any Reason to know why this Woman was particularly singled out for this Species of Persecution?
Except what I have stated.

From her Mother changing her Religion?
And not conforming to Father Mahir's Wish for her to do so.

You mentioned another Person named Bridget M'Carthy; what were the Facts with respect to her?
Bridget M'Carthy was obliged to quit the Queen's County, and come to reside in Carlow. She had given Information; and upon her Information, as she swore openly in the Court, there were Three Persons called White Feet transported, and in consequence of that she became very much persecuted.

Father

Father Mahir visited her and abused her; and she was then openly in the Streets hooted, and she was obliged to leave the Town. *Mr. H. Malcomson.*

You said that she swore openly in Court; was it upon the Occasion of any Criminal Proceeding?
Subsequent to her coming to reside in Carlow she underwent a great deal of Persecution from Persons that she was lodging with, and the Fact subsequently came before the Court.

Upon what Occasion?
Upon the Occasion of summoning Persons for abusing her, and for sounding Horns at the Door.

Are there any other Schools in Carlow besides the National School?
There are.

Of what Description?
There is the Protestant School, and a Lay School, quite convenient to the National School, attended by Catholics.

Is the Lay School a School which Protestants and Catholics go to?
No; the Lay School is a Roman Catholic School, and it is attended by Persons of the Roman Catholic Religion.

Do any Protestants attend that School?
I believe not.

Do any Roman Catholics attend the Protestant School?
I believe not; there may be some.

Is the Protestant School in connexion with the Kildare Place Society?
I cannot say; I presume it is not.

Are there any Schools in Carlow connected with the Kildare Street Society?
I cannot accurately say that there are.

Do you know whether there are any Schools at Carlow except the National School which Protestants and Roman Catholics attend indiscriminately?
In a Place called Graigue, adjoining Carlow, there is.

In Graigue, which is close to Carlow, there is also a National School?
There is.

Have you visited that National School?
I have.

When you were there how many Children were there?
I counted them, and I think Nineteen.

Did you ascertain how many were on the Rolls?
The Master said there were occasionally more.

In what State did the School appear to you to be?
It seemed in a very bad State; the Persons attending appeared to be in a very wretched State. It was a very cold Day; they were sitting without a Fire in a very large cold Room.

Did you ask the Master to show you the Books in which the Boys read the Scripture Lessons?
I did.

In what State were they?
They appeared quite new, and had no Appearance of being used and soiled. I asked him, had he any other Book that was used, and he showed me another, which also had no Appearance of being used.

What was that Book?
The Scripture Lessons.

How long had that School been established?
I presume several Years.

Mr. H. Malcomson.

Near to that School is there a Hedge School?
I heard from a Mr. Wilson that there was.

Did you go into it?
No.

You went into no other School at Graigue?
I did not.

How often did you visit the National School at Graigue?
But once.

How long were you there at that Time?
Perhaps Twenty Minutes.

Did you examine the Children to see whether they were well instructed?
I did; I asked one of them to read for me, and he read a Passage out of one of the Books.

What was the Result of that Examination?
He read pretty well; he seemed to be one of the oldest in the School.

Did you ask any of the younger ones to read?
No, I did not.

The only Person that you did ask read satisfactorily?
Yes.

But you thought the School seemed in a very bad State?
Yes.

Did you see any thing to find fault with in the Conduct of the Master?
No, I did not.

Did you enter your Observations in the Visitors Book?
No, I did not.

What were the Books they were reading in?
I think they had but Gough's Arithmetic.

Is that Graigue School under the Superintendence of Father Mahir?
No, it is not.

Are there any Protestant Children attending that School?
I believe not.

Do you know why the Protestant Children do not attend that School?
They prefer, I presume, attending the other School that is convenient to it.

There is a School convenient to it large enough for all the Protestants of that Village?
Yes, and in which there are a good many Roman Catholics, as I have heard, and have Reason to believe.

Have you ever heard any Objection made on the Part of Protestants to their Children attending that School in consequence of any Impropriety of Conduct on the Part of the Priest?
I never heard, to my Knowledge.

Who is the Priest of Graigue?
Mr. Rafter.

It is in the Parish of Killeshin?
It is.

Do the Roman Catholic and Protestant Children receive Education together at the Protestant School?
Yes.

Who is the Master of that Protestant School, or how is it supported?
It is supported partly by Contributions from Protestants.

And Roman Catholic Children attend that School?
I have heard there are Sixty or Seventy attending it.

They are educated in common with the Protestants?
They are.

Do you know a Priest named Gahan?
I do.

Is it the Reverend John Gahan of Rathvilly?
It is.

How far is that from Carlow?
About Seven or Eight Miles.

Are you aware that he is a Correspondent to the Board for Four Schools?
I have heard so.

Will you have the goodness to look at the printed Return before the Committee, and state whether that is his Name?
Yes, it is.

Is this Mr. Gahan of Rathvilly notorious as a violent Agitator?
He is known as such.

Has he ever within your Knowledge exhibited any remarkable Instance of that?
I have seen him accompany a very large Crowd of People into Carlow to attend what is called in Ireland a Tithe Sale, or a Sale of Cattle seized for Tithe.

Was this a peaceable Assemblage?
Quite the reverse; they came in a very riotous and tumultuous Manner.

Was he at the Head of them?
He was.

Had he any Inscription upon him?
No, I do not recollect that he had; but the Persons in whose Company he was had on their Hats Inscriptions, and Horns in their Hands blowing.

What were their Inscriptions?
"No Tithes; down with the Tithes," and such like.

Was this a Sale of Tithe seized on the Part of Mr. Wittey?
Yes.

Was Mr. Gahan evidently the Leader of this Mob?
Evidently; he seemed to have them perfectly under his Control.

Was the Sale prevented by Force at that Time?
I think it would be more just if I was to say that it was prevented by Intimidation.

Was it in point of fact prevented?
It was.

Was there Intimidation exerted by this Crowd?
There was.

Will you state what the Intimidation was?
Noise and Tumult, and Inscriptions on their Hats.

Was there any Force used?
No; there was no Necessity to resort to it.

Was there a great Number?
An amazing Number; I dare say there was, I might safely say, from Five to Eight thousand Persons.

You have no Doubt that the Number of Five or Eight thousand Persons produces Intimidation?
I am quite sure of it.

Was the Intimidation such as to prevent an Offer on the Part of any Person to buy?
Most unquestionably; yet there were many anxious to bid to my Knowledge.

Mr. H. Malcomson.

Therefore there would be no Occasion for Force to prevent the Sale?
Consequently not.

Do you know whether the Rev. John Gahan was the Patron of that School?
I heard that he was, and of Two or Three others.

Do you know the Reverend Richard Buggy?
I do.

What School had he to do with at that Time?
He was at Borris near Clonagoose in the County of Carlow.

Did he at any Time live in the Parish of Clonagoose?
I believe Borris is in the Parish of Clonagoose; it is not far from Borris.

Have you any Doubt that the Reverend Richard Buggy is the Person designated in the Paper before the Committee as the Correspondent?
I have no Doubt of it.

Do you recollect a Prosecution against a Person of the Name of Archibald Sly for the supposed Murder of a Person named Walsh?
I do.

In consequence of that Trial were any Persons indicted for Perjury?
There were Three Persons.

Were you present at the Trial?
I was.

Did you see the Reverend Richard Buggy there?
I did.

Did either of the Prisoners at first plead Guilty?
One of them did.

Did any thing happen at the Time in which the Reverend Richard Buggy was concerned after this Person had pleaded Guilty?
That Person was induced to withdraw his Plea of Guilty, and he afterwards pleaded Not Guilty.

Had the Reverend Richard Buggy any thing to do in this?
He had; immediately after the Prisoner had pleaded Guilty I saw Mr. Buggy communicate with the Prisoner's Agent, a Person of the Name of Tierney; he was in close Conversation with him for a few Minutes, and Mr. Tierney turned round to the Prisoner, and he afterwards withdrew his Plea of Guilty; I was quite convenient to the Prisoner.

Did you hear Mr. Buggy say any thing?
No.

In what Court did this Trial take place?
At the Assizes.

Did the Judge say any thing to induce the Man not to plead Guilty?
To my Knowledge the Judge did not take any Trouble to make him withdraw his Plea, and he did not hear any Communication that took place between the Prisoner's Attorney and Mr. Buggy.

Did the Judge tell him that he was not required to criminate himself?
I do not think he did; I did not hear him.

Who was the Judge?
Baron Smith.

Had you ever been in a Court of Justice before when a Prisoner pleaded Guilty?
I had.

Is not it usual for the Judge to advise the Prisoner not to plead Guilty?
That may be according to Circumstances. There were Two other Trials, if I recollect properly, upon the same Business, and the other Prisoners were found Guilty; if there were no Observations made perhaps that was the Reason

that the Judge did not think it necessary to make any Observations of that Kind.

What is the usual Practice in Ireland?
I believe the Practice is sometimes for the Judge to caution the Prisoner not to plead Guilty.

But that did not take place in this Instance?
I did not hear it.

Would you have heard it if the Judge had done so?
I think I should.

But his Attorney spoke to the Prisoner, and induced him to withdraw his Plea?
He did; he entreated him to do it more than once.

Did you hear what the Attorney said to the Prisoner?
He begged of him to withdraw his Plea; he said that he ought not to plead Guilty.

Did you hear it?
I heard the Conversation, and I told the Attorney myself that he was wrong in advising him so; that there could be no Doubt that he would be found Guilty.

Where were you?
Immediately under the Prisoner.

What was this Man accused of?
Perjury.

Did you think yourself justified in interfering and listening to any Communication from the Attorney to the Prisoner when he was upon his Trial?
It was not at all secret; I knew the Attorney intimately; I had seen the Prisoner in Gaol more than once or twice.

It was said loud enough for you to hear without listening?
Quite so.

Was it said loud enough for the Judge to hear?
Certainly not.

Was it loud enough for other Persons besides yourself to hear?
I cannot say that; I was talking to the Attorney upon the Business, and listening along with the Attorney to the Prisoner's Reply.

Did there seem to be any Unwillingness on the Part of either the Attorney or the Prisoner that you should hear?
Quite the contrary.

Do you consider the Observation you made to the Attorney as any Interference between the Solicitor and his Client?
Quite the contrary. I did it merely in a friendly Way. The Governor of the Gaol was addressing the Prisoner at the Time.

What was the Result of the Trial?
He was found Guilty.

What was the Sentence passed upon him?
I believe Transportation for Life, and previously to that Four Months Imprisonment.

For Perjury?
For Perjury.

What had Mr. Buggy to do with this?
He took a very active Part to defend the Prisoner.

Did he use any Inducement to the Prisoner to withdraw his Plea of Guilty?
He did not address the Prisoner: he addressed the Solicitor.

Mr. H. Malcomson.

Did you hear what he said to the Solicitor?
I did not; I had Reason to know what he said from a Note of his that I got.

Did the Trial take up any Length of Time?
Not very long.

Did not the whole of that Case make a very strong Impression upon the Public Mind in Ireland?
Very great indeed.

You mentioned that the Protestant and Catholic Children receive Education in common at a School, not the National School, in Graigue; do you know how that School is supported?
The School, I think, is supported partly by Contribution from the Protestant Inhabitants; I heard that from the Reverend Mr. O'Connor, the Protestant Curate.

Does he visit that School?
I have Reason to believe that he attends it very assiduously.

Does any Protestant Clergyman in Carlow visit the National School there?
I am not aware that any of them do.

Do any of them visit the Protestant School in Carlow?
The late Curate, the Reverend Mr. Armstrong, I believe, visited a great Number of Schools in the County.

Do you know any other School in the Neighbourhood where Protestant and Roman Catholic Children receive Education together?
I do not.

Do the Priests object to these Sixty or Seventy Roman Catholic Children going to that School at Graigue?
I heard that they do.

But they do not prevent their going?
Consequently not, when they attend them.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Mr. THOMAS HARRIS CARROLL is called in, and further examined as follows:

Do you know the Rushes National School?
I do.

In what Parish is it?
It is in the Parish of Killabin in the Queen's County.

How far from Carlow?
I think about Eight Miles from Carlow.

When did you visit it?
On the 31st of March in the present Year.

Were there any Protestant Scholars in that School?
The School was shut when I visited it.

Do you know whether there are any Protestant Scholars in it?
I do not think there are any. Upon the Occasion of my Visit to it I made Inquiries in the Neighbourhood, and I found that it had been shut about Three Weeks.

Did you hear why it was shut?
I called upon some of the Roman Catholic Parishioners, and they told me that the Master was dismissed, and the School was consequently shut up.

Did they tell you why the Master was dismissed?
They told me that it was in consequence of some Exposure that was made about the Rushes School.

Where?

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Where?
In Parliament.

Those Roman Catholics to whom you went; were they Persons of Substance?
Respectable Farmers, Tenants of Sir Charles Coote.

Was one of them named Murray?
Yes; I waited upon Murray.

Is he a respectable Farmer?
He is a respectable Farmer.

Did he withdraw his Children from the School before it was shut up?
He withdrew them about Eighteen Months before.

Why?
He had voted for his Landlord Sir Charles Coote, and after so doing his Children were beaten and abused in the School.

Was he a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?
A Roman Catholic. His Children were beaten and abused in the School, and called by the most opprobrious Names; and in consequence of the Treatment his Children had received in the School, as well as from the general Conduct of the Master, he withdrew his Children.

Did any other Roman Catholic Parishioner give you any Account of the School?
Yes; I waited upon a Man named Graham, a Roman Catholic, who is also a respectable Man. He told me that Dancing was taught in the School during School Hours, by the Master, and that it was practised in the School on Sundays by the Peasantry, and that such was the general Character of the School that he would not allow his Children to visit it.

Was that a School, as you understood, that had been built with the Assistance of the Board?
I understood that it was principally built at the Expense of the Board.

Did you hear from any of the Parishioners any Complaint respecting the Manner in which they had been compelled to assist in building the School?
Murray complained to me that Mr. Hickey the Priest compelled the Parishioners to send Horses and to send Labourers to the School to build it; and that he understood that Mr. Hickey was paid for erecting it, but they had received nothing whatever for what they contributed in Work and Labour to erect it.

Who told you that?
Murray; Sir Charles Coote's Tenant.

Did any others tell you the same?
The same was mentioned by Graham to me.

Were those some of the Persons who had employed their Horses?
Yes.

And they received nothing for it?
So they informed me.

Do you know how the Proposition was sent in to the National Board?
I cannot exactly state; but the Parishioners complained that they were not consulted.

Do you suppose that in sending in this Proposal to the National Board the Value of the Labour of those Horses and Men was not calculated?
I understood not.

Without having been previously consulted, did you understand that they had been compelled to do it?
Yes.

Compelled in what Way?
It is usual for the Roman Catholic Clergy in that Part of the Country to call

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

call upon the Parishioners from the Altar to contribute in Work and Labour to various Public Works.

By Compulsion you mean Advice from the Altar, but not by any Force?
Not by any Force.

In what Way did you understand they were compelled?
It is usual for the Priest of that Parish, in particular Mr. Hickey, to call upon his Parishioners by Name to supply a certain Number of Horses and Workmen to do certain Work; and he told them that they would be excluded from any Participation in the Benefit arising from the School if they did not do so. Accordingly, in compliance with the Command of the Priest, they sent their Workmen and their Horses. They afterwards applied to him for some Portion of Payment for the Work and Labour, and he refused giving it them. They told me of course upon that Occasion that they very reluctantly sent their Horses and their Workmen to the School; that they imagined that Mr. Hickey did not fairly account to the Parish for what was laid out upon the School.

Do you suppose that Mr. Hickey did not in the first instance tell them that he was going to make an Application to the Board before he did so?
They distinctly told me that they were not aware that Mr. Hickey made the Application.

They had not been called upon for Subscriptions of Money?
I do not think they were; what they did contribute was in the Way of Work.

Was not that in lieu of a Subscription in Money?
It was.

Is not it an usual Practice in Ireland, where the Parishioners are poor, or where it is more convenient that they should contribute in Labour to the Erection of Schools and Chapels, for them to do so instead of subscribing in Money?
It is.

Could they in fact get a Grant from the National Board without contributing something?
I am not aware of that.

Do not you know that it is a Rule of the National Board that a certain Proportion should be subscribed by the Parish seeking for the Assistance of the Board?
I certainly am not aware of it, for I do not know the Rules of the National Board.

Do you know whether this Clergyman used any Threats or any Exertion of Spiritual Power in this Case to induce them to send their Teams and their Labourers?
I do not.

The Rev. Charles Hickey appears to be the Manager of these Schools?
The Rev. Patrick Hickey is the same Person; I apprehend that it is a Mistake.

Is he notorious for Violence of Conduct or Language?
He is.

Have you any Instances to state?
The first Instance in which he rendered himself very notorious in Ireland was at a Public Meeting held against the Payment of Rents to Landlords.

Where was that Meeting held?
In the Chapelyard of Killeshin.

How far is that from Killaben?
I suppose not more than a Mile and a Half.

Did he make any Speech upon that Occasion?
He did; a very violent Speech against the Landlords of Ireland generally.

Have

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Have you a Copy of his Speech?
I have a Copy of a Report of it by a Person who was at the Meeting.

Have you published a Report of that Speech?
I have.

Is the Person that reported that Speech to you here?
He is.

What is his Name?
His Name is Daniel Murray. He is a distinct Person from Mr. Murray, who is Sir Charles Coote's Tenant.

Is he employed by you as a Reporter?
Occasionally.

Where does he reside?
In the Parish of Mr. Hickey, at a Place called Ballymoyler.

Is the Rev. Mr. Doran the Curate to Mr. Hickey in that Parish?
He is.

You have said that when you were at Rushes the National School was shut; did you visit any Scripture School there?
I did, in the Neighbourhood.

How far from the National School?
Not a Mile.

In the same Parish?
I think it is in the Protestant Parish; but the Boundaries of the Roman Catholic Parishes are not always the same. I suppose that both Parishes may be within the Protestant District.

At that Scripture School did you find many Children?
I found a good many Protestant and Roman Catholic Children together.

Did you inquire what was taught in the School?
I did.

What did you find had been taught there?
I found that the School was under the Kildare Street Society, under the immediate Patronage of Dean Dawson, the Dean of St. Patrick's, and Mr. Wandesford of Castlecomer; and that the general Branches of Education were taught there.

How many Protestant Children did you find?
There were upon the Occasion of my Visit Twenty Protestants and about Forty Roman Catholics, to the best of my Belief.

Did you understand that the Roman Catholic Children had always been in the habit of attending it?
Constantly.

Had they ever been forbidden to attend it?
I do not know.

Did you hear them read there?
I did not.

Did you ask them any Questions?
Very few.

Were they Scriptural Questions?
I asked them some Questions in Geography; and I asked the Head Class what Portion of Scripture they read. They appeared to be perfectly acquainted with their Business. They were most intelligent, very decently clad, and altogether the School appeared to be a very great Credit to the Patrons of it. There were Forty Roman Catholic Children very respectably dressed, Male and Female, in the Two Schools.

You said that you heard that the Priest required from the Altar that the Tenants and poor People should give their Carts and Horses and Labour for the Erection

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

of the Schoolhouse; suppose that the People were to be paid for it, would they not have done it without his Interference?

I should suppose they would. The only Objection they appeared to entertain towards it was, that they thought the Funds given to Mr. Hickey by the National Board were quite sufficient to erect the School without their Labour.

In point of fact is not it another Way of paying the Subscription?
It may be so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. D. Murray.

Mr. DANIEL MURRAY is called in, and examined as follows.

Where do you reside?
At Ballymoyler in Queen's County.

Were you ever at the School at Rushes?
I have been often there.

What was the State of the School before it was shut up?
It was in a very proper State for a Schoolhouse.

Do you know any thing about a Proceeding before a Magistrate in which the Master was concerned?
I do.

What do you know about it?
I recollect, about the 14th of last December, the Schoolmaster, Thomas Lawler, summoned a Farmer, William Norton, to the Petty Sessions of Ballymoyler.

How do you know he did that? Were you present at the Time of the Hearing of the Summons?
I was; I was on the Bench at the Time.

The Case was inquired into before the Magistrates in your Presence?
It was.

You are not a Magistrate?
No.

Did you take Notes of what took place?
I did.

Have you got those Notes here?
No, I have not, because I gave them to the Editor of the Carlow Sentinel.

Were they published in the Carlow Sentinel?
They were not.

Can you state from your Recollection what passed?
I can. This Thomas Lawler summoned William Norton for Wages alleged to be due for the Tuition of his Children in the Rushes Schoolhouse. Norton stated that the Reason he did not pay it was, that his Children had not completed their Time, and that he took them away after being there a few Weeks; and the Reason he gave was, that it was an improper School; that the Schoolmaster taught Music and Dancing in the School; and he also mentioned that a great deal of very improper People assembled there during the Time, and he took the Children away in consequence of that. Lawler was asked upon his Oath, by One of the Magistrates, was that the Case, he said it was; that it was according to the German Plan, as well as my Recollection serves me. He was asked why he had done so; he said he had done so by the Directions of the Manager, Father Hickey.

Did Norton complain that Music and Dancing were taught instead of other Branches of Education, or that it was taught in addition to them?
I understood in addition to them; that it was taught in the School. He did not complain of the other Branches that were taught in it.

Mr. D. Murray.

Was it during School Hours that the Dancing took place?
I heard no Mention to the contrary. I understood by the Evidence that the Man meant during School Hours.

And that his Ground of resisting the Demand was that his Children during School Hours had to learn Dancing instead of the other Business of the School?
He did not say that they had to learn Dancing, but he said that Music and Dancing was taught in the School, and that improper People resorted there.

Did he complain that Music and Dancing was taught on the Sunday?
No; I do not know that there was any School on the Sunday.

Did you ever hear of any Dancing in this School on the Sunday?
I heard say from the People round there that there has been Dancing in the Schoolhouse on the Sundays.

What do you mean by "improper People"?
When I say "improper People" I give it merely as his, Norton's, Words, because he did not mention who the People were.

He did not say who the "improper People" were?
He did not.

He used the Word "improper"?
He did.

Improper in his Opinion?
I judged so.

What did the Magistrates do; did they award the Wages or dismiss the Complaint?
They gave the Wages.

Did you ever hear of any Cattle being locked up in the School?
I did, from the People in the Neighbourhood, particularly from Two Farmers that lived just convenient, of the Name of Murray.

On what Occasion did they say that those Cattle were locked up in the School?
The Sheriff about the Time that the Cattle were locked up came to post Notices for the Reverend Archdeacon Stopford for Tithe; at that Time the Farmers were apprehensive that it was to seize Cattle in the Parish for Tithe, and the People were running away with them; and the Murrays told me that a Lot of Cattle were locked up in the School, and they remained there till the Sheriff went away.

Were they there in order to conceal them from the Sheriff?
So the People told me.

Were there any Protestant Children attending the School?
Not one.

Do you know of any Children besides Norton's being withdrawn from the School?
I heard of it from the Father.

What was it he said?
He said that the Conduct of the Master was not such as he liked. His Name was Matthew Hutchinson.

Are there any Scripture Schools in that Parish?
There are Two.

Are they well attended?
They are not; the Roman Catholic Children have been taken out of them since those other Schools were erected.

Before those other Schools were erected Roman Catholic Children attended them?
They did, and particularly the Ballymoyler School, which was under the Kildare Street Society; I recollect seeing the List, and they came up to nearly

Mr. D. Murray.

200; I should judge there might be about Thirty Protestants at that Time, and the rest were Roman Catholics.

Do you remember the Reverend Mr. Hickey attending any Meeting at Killeshin?
I do.

Were you present?
I was.

Did you make any Report of what he said?
I did take Notes.

Have you got those Notes?
I have, and the Paper in which they were published.

Where was this Speech delivered?
In the Churchyard of Killeshin.

Will you read from those Notes what you have heard Father Hickey say at this Meeting?
"We now stand upon holy Ground; the new Chapelyard and the old Churchyard near us;—Ground which, it is well known, contains the Bodies of many Saints, who can witness whether our Thoughts and Actions this Day are good or bad. Ireland has long been oppressed by the hard-hearted Landlord; the poor and industrious Farmer has been long ground to Dust by the Agent, the Driver, and the Landlords who, if you went to look for them, you should go to Italy, to France, to England, and to Jarmony; who, like wild Geese, are flying from one Country to another; who are spending the hard-earned Industry of the poor Landholder in other Countries. The rich Landlord was like unto Dives of the Scripture, wallowing in Wealth, while the Poor were laid at their Gate, sliding into Eternity by Hunger. Why I can tell you their Religion is contrary to the Bible, which says, love your Neighbour as yourself; do unto others as they should do unto you. I ask any of you, would they not take, if possible, the Potatoes from the Mouths of your famished Offspring. The Landlords are like evil Spirits arising out of the Sea and Land, at the Sight of whom the unfortunate Tenant trembles with Dismay. While those Wretches the Landlords appear to them just like Imps arrived from the Draw-farm of Hell, I, as a Priest, address you. Mr. Connor has come amongst you this Day to propose Measures for your Good. It equally behoves all, no matter what Religion or what Persuasion, to lend a helping Hand, and, with the Blessing of God, we shall succeed. God likes Help. We have succeeded in greater Things than this. That Rack-rents have been the Ruin of Ireland is well known, and will ever continue so to do until the natural Proprietors of the Soil shall have the Land at a fair Value." Here his Reverence proceeded for some Time in the same Strain, but his imperfect Delivery at this Period prevented my following him.

Who is Mr. Connor?
A respectable Farmer who lives at Inch in that County.

What did he come to propose?
This was an Anti-rent Meeting.

Was the Object of this to prevent the People from paying their Rents?
No, it was not; it was in order to have a Bill sent into Parliament to have Valuators appointed in every Parish to have the Land valued, and that the Rent should rise or fall in a certain Scale according to the Price of Corn.

Was the Object then to procure the Substitution of a System of Corn Rents for a System of Money Rents?
Yes.

And to do that by the Interposition of Parliament?
Yes.

This was a Meeting to petition?
To draw up Resolutions.

Which were intended to be the Foundation of a Petition?
Yes.

Was

637

Mr. D. Murray.

Was any thing further said by Mr. Hickey on that Day?
There was a little more.—"The Reverend Mr. Hickey then came forward. He was understood to say that a Petition would shortly be ready against the next Sitting of Parliament for a Redress of Grievances of the Irish Tenantry." That is all I have in my Manuscript.

Did you ever attend any other Meeting at which Mr. Hickey spoke?
I did.

What Meeting was that?
A Meeting at Arles.

When was this?
In December 1834.

Did you take Notes upon that Occasion?
I did.

Did you give them to any one to publish?
I gave them to the Editor of the Carlow Sentinel.

Have you any Doubt that is an accurate Publication?
Not the slightest Doubt.

Did you compare the Paper you now have in your Hand with the Manuscript Notes?
I did.

Are they the same?
They are the very same.

What was the declared Object of this Meeting?
Respecting the Nomination of Two Members to send to the House of Commons.

On what Day of the Week was it?
On Sunday.

Where was it held?
In the Chapelyard of Arles.

Were there many Roman Catholic Clergy present?
I think there were Three.

Do you recollect who they were?
Mr. Hickey and Mr. Doran, the Roman Catholic Curate of that Parish; and there was another Curate present, Father Tracey.

Did not Father Tracey afterwards go to another Parish?
I understood that he did.

What Parish was that?
I do not know.

What did you hear Hickey say at this Meeting?
I will read it; "The Reverend Mr. Hickey rose, but from his bad Delivery we could not collect what he said. However, he concluded by saying that the Time they had been waiting for, now upwards of 100 Years, was now at Hand. That Revelation and Prophecy showed them that if they laid their Switch on their Enemies they would shrink into nothing."

That was upon sending Two Members to Parliament?
Yes; this was the Occasion of it.

Was this all of Mr. Hickey's Speech that you reported?
Yes.

You have no Doubt of those Expressions?
No; that was the chief Part of what I could collect.

Do you write Short-hand?
No, I do not; I take Notes.

Mr. D. Murray.

Did the Curates make any Speech there?
Both Curates.

Who are those Enemies he spoke of?
Except from my own Opinion, I cannot say; but I consider every Person bearing the Name of Protestant is what they call their Enemies. That is what I understand.

Might it not mean those who opposed the Two popular Candidates?
No; I could not believe that at all, from his mentioning the Words "Revelation and Prophecy," because at the present Time in Ireland they have a Prophecy amongst them that there will be about this Time but One Religion in Ireland; and certainly the lower Orders have been looking forward with a firm Belief that the Time has now arrived.

You understand the Meaning to be that the Prophecy alludes to the Times that are now about, and that at this Time they were to get Political Power. Is that the Understanding, as far as you know?
Not Political Power. But I understood this; that from Pastorini's History of the Christian Church they are confirmed in the Belief that they were to get Religious Power; that there would be but one Religion in Ireland.

Do you not understand that the Period to which Pastorini's Prophecy referred is now passed?
I have heard so.

Do you understand that the People believe that those Prophecies have relation to the present Period?
Most Part of the Roman Catholic lower Order in Ireland believe it at the present Time.

You understood this Priest as then addressing himself to that Belief?
I did.

Are those Prophecies which you describe as prevailing among the lower Order of Roman Catholics supposed to refer to the Prophecies of Pastorini?
It was my Opinion that he referred to the Opinion that the People were of at the Time.

You have stated that Father Hickey made use of the Words "Revelation and Prophecy;" do you consider that he alluded to Pastorini in both those Expressions?
I consider that he alluded to the present Belief that is now prevalent in Ireland among the lower Orders. He did not mention any particular Prophecy.

Did you understand that the Priest applied any Prophecy or Revelation to the contested Election then going forward?
I could not conceive that he did.

You understood him to apply it generally to the State of Things in Ireland?
I did.

Is not the usual Place of holding Meetings on Occasions of this Sort on a Sunday in the Churchyard?
Generally in the Roman Catholic Churchyard or somewhere near it.

Is the National School in the Chapelyard?
No; there is a School which has the Words "National School" painted on a conspicuous Part of it, but I understand it is not yet placed under the National Board.

When you said the Churchyard did you mean the Burial-yard attached to the Church of the Church of England?
No; I meant the Burial-ground attached to the Roman Catholic Chapel.

Is it usual to hold Election Meetings or any Meetings of that Sort in the Churchyards of the Church of England?
I have never heard of any.

5.19

Mr. D. Murray.

Was there much Discussion, or were they all of one Mind?
The Speakers appeared all of one Mind.

And were the Audience?
Generally, except a few Individuals.

Nobody expressed any Sentiments on the opposite Side of the Question?
There were no Speeches on the opposite Side.

Are you a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?
I am a Protestant.

Was there any Objection made to your coming to take Notes upon that Occasion?
No.

Were you known at the Meeting at the Churchyard to be a Reporter of the Carlow Sentinel?
I was not; but there were some few who knew it. If I had gone there as a public Reporter I would have been afraid,—if I was known to be a Reporter to the Carlow Sentinel. I would have done so at the Risk of my own Life.

Did you while there make your Notes, or after you got out?
I took them while there; I stood on one Side and took them; a few of the Police were near me; there were Police ordered there that Day to see that there would be no rioting.

Were there any Reporters for other Newspapers there?
I understood that there were.

Then it would not be necessarily supposed that you were reporting for the Sentinel?
A great many knew it, but not all.

Do you constantly attend the Petty Sessions as a Reporter?
Very often; when I hear of any thing of Importance I do so.

What took you there upon that Occasion when the Schoolmaster summoned the Father of the Children; was it in consequence of that Business?
No; I did not go there for the Purpose of reporting at all, but the Petty Sessions Clerk a few Days before that was absent, and he requested me to issue Summonses for him in his Absence, and then I went there upon that Day to give him the List of the Summonses when he came into the Petty Sessions House, in order that he should enter them; that was what brought me there on that Day.

What is your Business?
A Farmer generally.

Were you ever present upon any Occasion when Father Buggy made any Speech?
I do not recollect.

How long have you been employed in the Capacity of Reporter?
About Two Years for the Carlow Paper.

How were you occupied before that?
A Farmer; and I had reported for the Evening Packet before that Time.

Had you ever been engaged in any other Occupation or Pursuit but that of Farming before you became a Reporter?
I lived with my Father a short Time before that, and my Father was a Man of Property till he died; at another Time I was extensively engaged in the Silk Business in Kilkenny, and through rather untoward Circumstances I was obliged to give it up.

Were you ever employed as a Steward for any Gentleman?
I was for a short Time for a Mr. Cooper, of Cooper Hill in the Queen's County.

Why did you leave Mr. Cooper?
He wished to get a more practical Steward than I was.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Mr. THOMAS HARRIS CARROLL is again called in, and further examined as follows:

Do you know Ballinabrana School?
I do.

In what Parish is Ballinabrana?
It is in the Parish of Leighlin Bridge.

How far from Carlow?
About Three Miles and a Quarter.

That is Father Kehoe's Parish?
It is.

Will you look at the List of the Correspondents of the Board and see whether that is the Name?
His Name is Patrick Kehoe.

He is the Parish Priest of Leighlin Bridge?
He is.

Did you ever visit that School?
I did.

When?
On the 15th of March last.

Was it open?
It was shut.

Was it on a Holiday?
No, it was not; the Female School was open.

Did you understand why it was shut?
I inquired, and could get no satisfactory Information.

Was there any Election going on at the Time?
There was not.

How are the Schools situated?
They are situated in the Chapelyard.

Male and Female, both?
Both; not under the same Roof.

Is there any Access to them without going through the Chapelyard?
There is to the Male School.

Is there to the Female School?
Without going through the Chapelyard you could not go into the Female School. The Male School opens out on the Road, and the Female School opens into the Chapelyard.

Were there any Protestants there?
None whatever that I could discover. The Master said there were no Protestants in the School.

Is the Master notorious for any thing in particular?
The Male School I visited on the 15th, and went from that to the Reverend Mr. Dixon, the Protestant Curate of the Parish in which Ballinabrana is situated; and I did so, from having ascertained that there were many Protestants in the School, and from hearing in the Neighbourhood that they were greatly abused during the late Election in Carlow.

In what Way abused?
Two Boys, whose Names were Alexander and William Matheson, upon the First Day of the Election, having attended the School as usual, the Master called the Roman Catholic Boys out of the School, and told them to shout for a Party of Persons that were going to Carlow to vote for the popular Candidates; and upon that Occasion, as I am informed by the attested Report which the Boys have made, the Master left the School and went to Carlow

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

They were ill-treated in the Absence of the Master from the School; on going home that Evening they were beaten on the Road, and they did not return to School during the whole Week through Fear of Ill-treatment.

How do you know they were beaten on the Road?
From their own attested Statement.

Did they tell you so themselves?
They did; and I will produce the attested Report.

Do you mean by Affidavit?
No; a voluntary Affidavit is not legal.

Was this a Report made by them to you?
Yes; in the Presence of their own Clergyman, written down by the Clergyman himself. This is a Statement made by Two Protestant Boys of that School.

Does it profess to be signed by them?
It does not profess to be signed by them, but it is a Document taken down on the Spot by the Rev. Mr. Dixon, and given to me by Mr. Dixon.

Were you present when this was taken down?
I was not.

When the Boys gave this Account?
I went for the very Purpose of getting this Document.

Who desired you to go?
I got Information from Mr. Dixon by Letter; he requested me to call upon him, and that he would get me this Document from under their own Hands, and accordingly I went.

Did he write to you in consequence of a Communication from you?
He wrote in consequence of a Communication made by the Mother or the Aunt of the Two Boys, and the Lads refused to go to School. In consequence of that he wrote to me requesting that I would take the Statement, and his Object in doing so was to give me the fullest Account of it.

Will you read it?
"On Wednesday 15th of February 1837, John Conway, the Master of Ballinabrana National School, on entering the School-room desired the Boys to run out and cheer for Vigors' Freeholders, who were then passing the Road adjoining the School, escorted by a Priest named Byrne; the Protestant Boys Alexander and William Matheson were desired to remain in their Seats. When the Boys returned into the School-room after cheering the Freeholders, one of them demanded of Alexander Matheson, "How did you like that;" and collaring him said, "I will shake the Puddings out of you." The Master did not return to the School on that Day, but Two Boys, Larry Mahon and Michael Hennesy, taught School. On returning from School William Matheson was knocked down in the Gutter, as he believes, for not having shouted; in consequence of such Treatment, William Matheson and Alexander were afraid to go to School during that Week and remained at home."

Was the Master present when they were so ill-treated?
They said that the Master was on the Road when the Boys were turned back.

Then he was not present when they were so insulted?
He was not.

What were the Ages of those Boys?
I suppose one about Twelve and the other about Fourteen Years of Age, and tolerably far advanced.

Have they remained at the School since?
Not to my Knowledge.

Do you know that they have not?
I do not. I asked Mr. Dixon at the Time would they go back to that

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

School, and their Aunt told him that they should never go back to that School if they had a Second to go to.

Is there any other School in the Neighbourhood?
No.

Were there any other Protestant Children in that School?
There was One Protestant named Collier in the School; he was withdrawn about Three Months before, as I am informed.

Do you know whether there are any remaining now?
I do not.

Do you know whether any Complaint upon this Subject was addressed to the Board of Education by Mr. Dixon?
I do not think there was.

Does Mr. Dixon the Protestant Clergyman visit that School?
I think he told me he visited it once in consequence of having some of his Parishioners at the School.

But once only?
But once only.

Did you, having become cognizant of these Circumstances by hearing the Complaint of these Children before Mr. Dixon, address any Communication to the Board of Education upon the Subject?
I did not.

Have you heard that any was addressed by any other Person?
I have not.

Did you take any other Step in consequence of having received this Information?
I will state what I intended to have done. My Intention was to address the Public upon the Conduct of the Schoolmaster and the Patron of the School; but I judged it more prudent afterwards to withhold that Statement, and to keep the Documents; and if they could be of any Use hereafter either to acquaint the Board or the Public with the Matter.

Do you think it would not have been making a proper Use of the Documents to have communicated them to the Board of Education?
I think it may be making proper Use of them; but I was not acquainted with any Gentleman connected with the Board, nor did I know the Secretary to write officially to him.

Do you mean to say that it was from the Want of Knowledge of the Names of the Persons who constitute the Board of Education that you were induced to abstain from communicating to them any of those Facts?
No.

Then what do you mean?
I mean to say that when I received this Document it was my Intention to have published it; after that I thought it more prudent not to do so till I had communicated with the Protestant Clergyman; and in the Interim I saw that a Committee had been formed for the Purpose of inquiring into Education in Ireland; and I thought I might more properly appropriate this to other Purposes in order to show the Committee; and thus proving to the Country how the Schools were conducted.

You reserved those Facts then for this Committee?
I intended to forward them to the most prominent Person that I could see interest himself in Education.

Whom did you forward them to?
I forwarded an Account of them to the Bishop of Exeter.

Had you any Communication with the Protestant Clergy in Ireland upon this Subject?
With various Protestant Clergymen.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

What was the Advice they gave upon it?
I do not say that they gave me any particular Advice.

You stated that you intended to take their Advice, and you were asked what Advice they gave you, when you consulted them?
I first received various Communications from Protestant Clergymen with regard to Abuses that existed in some of the Schools; they wished me to publish frequently those Abuses, but I make it a Rule never to publish any thing till it is authenticated, either upon Oath or by the Signature of some most respectable Person; and, accordingly, I kept a good many of those Documents by me, in order to satisfy myself that the Statements were correct, and I visited many of the Schools individually in consequence.

Have any of those Protestant Clergymen who requested you to publish those Abuses acquainted you whether they had made, or wished you to make, any Communication to the Board of Education upon the Subject?
Not one of them.

Did they express a Wish that you should not make a Communication to the Board of Education?
No; they did not.

Did they express a Wish that you should communicate to the Bishop of Exeter?
They preferred it; they certainly preferred presenting any Document that they themselves had to Parliament.

Did they request you to communicate this Document to the Bishop of Exeter?
Many of them did not.

From how many Clergymen had you Communications of this Sort?
I had a Communication from the Reverend Mr. O'Connor, from the Reverend Mr. Braden, and a Communication from the Reverend Mr. Dixon.

From how many had you a Communication?
I shall confine myself to probably Five; at the same Time I am certain that I had with Eight or Nine, but I shall confine myself to those that I can immediately recollect.

Was it in consequence of those Communications that you visited those Schools?
It was; and with a Determination to ascertain whether those Abuses did really exist or not.

You said, upon a former Occasion, that you are not friendly to this System of Education?
I cannot say that I am friendly to it, but I certainly had no Charges that I could rely on to make against the Schools till I convinced myself of the Existence of Abuses by personal Attendance.

You disapprove of the System?
I have always disapproved of the System.

When you made these Communications to the Bishop of Exeter was this Committee appointed?
Yes.

It was notorious that the House of Lords had appointed a Committee of Inquiry into the System?
Quite so.

Was it with a view of affording any Information to this Committee that you made those Visits?
For no other Reason but to give the Noblemen of this Committee the most satisfactory Information I could procure; I had no other Object directly or indirectly.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Was it not a Fact that you visited several of those Schools after the Appointment of this Committee?
It was.

And this was one of them?
It was.

You publish an Account of the Debates in the Houses of Parliament in your Paper?
I do, generally.

Do you read them yourself?
I do.

Do you happen to know that this Committee was appointed, not on the Motion of the Bishop of Exeter, but on the Motion of Lord Melbourne?
I am perfectly acquainted with the Fact.

Are you also aware that the Bishop of Exeter spoke upon that Occasion?
Yes.

And that the Bishop of Exeter spoke in the last Session of Parliament upon this Subject?
Perfectly so.

And you thought it not unnatural to send the Papers to the Bishop, who had taken up the same general View of the Matter which you yourself entertained?
That is the Course I would always adopt under all the Circumstances.

Are you aware that the Bishop of Exeter last Year made a Motion for a Committee without Success?
I am.

Are you aware that the Bishop of Exeter had, before the Motion was made by Lord Melbourne, given Notice that he should, upon a certain Day, make a Motion to the same Effect?
Yes.

Is Father Kehoe, the Manager of this School, notorious in any respect in Ireland?
I am sorry to say that he is.

For what?
For the Violence of his Opposition to the Landed Proprietors.

What do you mean by the Violence of his Opposition to the Landed Proprietors; do you mean to their Persons or to their Rents, or to what?
I mean to the general Rights of Property in Ireland; I have known that Gentleman not to spare any Class of Men.

In what Way?
In public Abuse.

What was the Conduct by which he opposed the Landed Proprietors?
He was One of those who, with Mr. Hickey, conceived it necessary to enter into a Crusade against their Rights; that is, to reduce Rents in Ireland, and to overthrow Tithes.

Is he notorious for having made a celebrated Harangue at his Altar, dressed in his Canonicals, upon any Occasion?
Yes; this purports to be "The Address of the Reverend Patrick Kehoe to his Congregation from the Altar of the Chapel at Leighlin Bridge, on Sunday the 14th of June."

Will you read it?

The

The Witness reads the same as follows : *Mr. T. H. Carroll.*

" Is there any one here who will barter his Soul for his Landlord? There is one Wretch that has done so. Do you know who I mean? I mean Pat. Neil,—the hypocritical, proselytizing apostate Lick-spittle, Pat. Neil, and his Brother.—This Miscreant got 70*l.* a Year for voting against his Country, his Religion, and his God, on the last Election, and he now expects to have that increased to 150*l.*; besides, his Landlord bribes him in every possible Manner; and the base Wretch, who once acknowledged that if he was a Scholar he would be hanged—but he's no Scholar, but the most ignorant Brute in the County—now exults in being the Lick-spittle of his Landlord. Now see how he makes his apostate Gain: he has a Horse worth Ten Shillings, and gets Twenty Shillings for it, and so for every thing else. I say, Pat. Neil, you are a detestable, hypocritical Apostate, Lick-spittle, a Ruffian and a Miscreant, to be held up by the Finger to Scorn and Detestation and Contempt.—And what are you the richer than any honest Freeholder after all, when your Debts are paid? About the Oath you have to take at the Election, Boys, I want to speak a few Words to you. [After reading the Bribery Oath, Father Kehoe dwelt on the Word 'indirectly.'] Mark this, good People, 'indirectly!'—that is, if one gets Leave to draw Turf, is lent Sacks, is taken into his Landlord's Employment, or other Things of that Kind, for his Vote. Now this is the Way Pat. Neil is bribed by Alexander: he gets Leave to take what Land he likes, gets Leave to take what Turf he likes, is made his Process-server, his Time-server, and his Devil's-server, and he (I mean Pat. Neil,) goes about to the other Freeholders, striving to tempt them, as the Devil tried to tempt the Saviour, and says, 'All these Things will Alexander give you if you will worship him.' 'I expect,' says Pat. Neil, 'to have a higher Post after this Election; for I'll have 150*l.* a Year, and then you may step into my present Post.' Oh the Wretch! But don't you barter your Soul and sell your Country, your Religion, and your God, for Alexander or any tyrannical Landlord. Good People, I'm told Policemen come here.—Look out for them, and if you see any Policemen here that are not Catholics, their only Object must be to create a Disturbance; therefore mark down their Names, and I'll soon take care that they shall not long have Occasion to wear their Green Coats and Black Belts. About these Policemen,—do you know?—I suppose you don't, but I'll tell you. There are 375 Chiefs among them, receiving from 500*l.* to 1,500*l.* a Year each. And how many of these Chiefs are Catholics? Six! Does not this prove that all Posts of Emolument are shut against you because you are Catholics? Well, the Serjeants. Now a Serjeant has about Six Pounds a Year more than a common Policeman. Well now, how many of these Serjeants are Protestants? Why, Two Thirds! So that the paltry Difference of 6*l.* a Year makes them choose Protestants for their Serjeants. Why they ought to be at least Four Fifths Catholics;—then indeed they would find you assisting them at the Fairs to keep the People quiet. The Conservatives say a large Number of Soldiers are come to Carlow, but they have received strict Orders not to escort the Voters; so you have all in your own Hands. Besides, the Government has sent down Three Magistrates, who are to have the entire Command of the Army, to the Exclusion of all the County Magistrates; so, good People, all is in your own Power, and the Government too is very different from the last. But these Conservative Landlords threaten to deprive you of your Leases. That they can't do. Why so? They dare not, though they are most anxious to wallow up to their Knees in Human Blood,—in your Blood, good People, and to bring about again the Rebellion of 1798; and their Object is to bring your Daughters to Prostitution, and your Sons to Beggary; but they dare not. Why? Because before the End of this Session of Parliament a Body of Poor Laws will be in force, and every Tenant that every Landlord ejects that same Landlord will be obliged to support. And who are these bloody Landlords; these tyrannical Despots? Why they are Fellows whose Names were not known when your Ancestors possessed the Land they now possess; but a Time will soon come that will oblige them to prove what Right and Title they have to their Possessions. Well, good People, will you now be true to your Religion, your Country, and your God, in spite of the Tyranny of your Landlords; in spite of Alexander and his Son; the Two who first obliged their Tenants to pay blood-stained Tithes; who, after the last Election, because their Tenants voted

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

for their Country and their Conscience, issued Latitats, the Expence of which amounted to *2l. 5s. 6d.*, to enforce the Payment of Sums of Money not exceeding *6l.*? I am told that Two Conservative Brats, Sons of this Alexander, are now at the Cross below, terrifying the Freeholders as they are coming to Mass; but I'll teach these Chaps not to terrify honest Freeholders. Good People, you must swear at the Election that you vote for 'fit and discreet Men to represent the County of Carlow in Parliament.' Is Bruen a discreet Man? What, Bruen! Orange Bruen! He who always opposed Catholic Emancipation till it was extorted from the Government, and his Opposition could be no longer any Injury to you! Is it Bruen, who said in Parliament (the only Time he did not give a silent Vote) that the Priests instigated the People to commit Murder and all Kinds of Outrage, and that till the Priests were exterminated the Country would not be fit for a Christian to live in; that one Priest said to a Man who did not wish to vote on the liberal Side, 'I'll make the Wafer melt before it comes to your Mouth;' that another Priest said, 'I'll turn you into a Goat if you don't vote for us;' and another said, 'I'll turn you into Flaggers if you don't vote with me!' Is this a fit and discreet Person to represent the County of Carlow; this hard-hearted, tyrannical Landlord? Well, what of Kavanagh? Is he a fit and discreet Person to represent you? Why, he's dead. So the Dublin Freeman's Journal and the Kilkenny Journal say; but if he's not dead he's always laid up in the Gout. Is this a fit and discreet Man to represent the County of Carlow? Oh Boys, take care and don't perjure yourselves. Why this Bruen always supported Tithes; blood-guilty Tithes; Tithes that have murdered and bayonetted you; that have dragged you out of your quiet and peaceable Beds, and have torn the very Sheets and Blankets from under you; that have bayonetted you as they did at Rathcormac and Newtonbarry. But I tell you, if you gain this Election, before the End of the Year there will be no such Things as Tithes; and even now a Bill for the total Extinction of Tithes has passed the Second Reading of the House of Commons; it only requires a Third Reading to become the Law of the Land, for as Peel himself said, neither the Lords nor the King dare refuse what the House of Commons pass into a Law. Well, Boys, Bruen and Kavanagh, I think you'll agree with me, are neither fit, discreet, nor honest Men to represent the County of Carlow. But I'll tell you who are honest Men. Vigors is an honest Man; he who has taken upon himself the People's Rights, and is determined to protect them. But you know him well enough. We tried to get an Irishman, and applied to several other Gentlemen of the County to side with Vigors; but they all refused. An English Gentleman however has volunteered; Mr. Raphael, High Sheriff of the City of London, who has plenty of Money, and plenty of Honesty. Vote, then, for Vigors and Raphael, and you'll vote for yourselves, your Country, your Religion, and your God. Is there any Man will tell me that Agitation has done nothing for Ireland? Where are Tithes now? Although Catholics are still kept out of Offices of Emolument, still there is no such Things as Tithes now; I mean you no longer have to pay Tithes, but a pitiful Land Tax; and we'll soon put an End to that too. The Protestant Clergy are now very different from what they were; they are no longer the fine Gentlemen they were, but are in a sad Hobble, and we'll make them in a greater Hobble; for instead of bringing up their Sons and Daughters to be Gentlemen and Ladies they'll be glad to bring them up to be Farmers and Tradesmen like yourselves, good People. Boys, Vigors and Raphael intend to address you after Mass, and I desire that you'll not leave the Chapelyard till you have heard them. These Orange Conservatives are very confident, like the Devil when he tempted our Saviour in the Wilderness; but we'll strike Fear and Terror into their Hearts on Tuesday. I hope it will not be necessary for us to draw the Sword, for I hope the very Sight of the Scabbard will be enough to frighten them. But I tell you, Boys, if the Conservatives gain this Election,—they can't gain it,—but if by Perjury, Threats, and Violence they do gain it,—if they do trick us out of our Representatives on this, as they did at the last Election, not be beat, more Blood will flow than there is Water in the River Barrow. Come then, good People, to the Poll at once. I denounce that Man who will not come to the Poll at once as one who is tampering with his Landlord, as one who is waiting to see on which Side the Scales may turn; and I'll suspect that Man to be a Renegade and an Apostate."

Did Mr. Carter Hall give that to you as a Report made by him of the Speech? *Mr. T. H. Carroll.*

He did; I got it through Mr. Alexander, with whom he lived at the Time; and I published it.

Who printed this?
I did.

Is this printed for the Carlow Sentinel?
No, it is not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 2° Maii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS HARRIS CARROLL is called in, and further examined as follows:

Have you visited any School at Newton?
I have.

Where is Newton?
It is situated in the County of Carlow, about Eight Miles from Carlow.

How are the Schools situated there?
The Male and Female Schools are under the same Roof, situated in the Chapelyard, within a few Yards of the Chapel.

Is it possible to get to those Schools without going through the Chapelyard?
No.

The Reverend A. Phelan is returned as the Correspondent of Three Schools there?
He is.

When did you visit those Schools?
On the 18th of March last.

How were they conducted?
The Female School was shut up for a very considerable Period.

You found it shut up, and you were informed that it had been shut up?
I did; and I saw a Report upon the Books by the Inspector of the National Board, expressing his Surprise that upon the Occasion of the Two last Visits the Female School was shut up. I made particular Inquiries, and I found that the Inspector had recommended the Dismissal of this Woman: that she was for a short Time dismissed, and that the Priest brought her back again. I made further Inquiry about who she was, and I found that she was educated in a Convent in Carlow.

Do you know who the Inspector was?
Mr. M'Dermott.

Did you go into the Male School?
I did.

Was there a good Attendance in the Male School?
There were Twenty-three Boys in attendance.

Were there any Protestants among them?
The Master told me there were Seven Protestants in the School, but on examining the Register I found that the Names of the Seven Protestants were struck off the Roll; and on further Inquiry I found that they had been withdrawn from the School from Christmas last.

Is the Reverend Mr. Phelan, the Manager of those Schools, notorious for Political Violence or Agitation?
Unfortunately he has been for the last Five or Six Years.

Have there been any Meetings held in the Chapelyard in which the School is situated?
Yes, in that Chapelyard.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Were you present?
I was not, but I had a Reporter who was upon the Spot.

Is the Reporter here?
I think Mr. Murray was the Reporter; he is here.

Was Mr. Phelan there?
Upon that Occasion Mr. Phelan was there; but owing to the Inclemency of the Weather the Meeting did not take place. But I attended One or Two Meetings myself immediately adjoining that Parish, when Mr. Phelan himself made Speeches.

Did you hear him make those Speeches?
I did.

Will you state any thing that he said?
The principal Portion of Mr. Phelan's Observations were directed against Lord Beresford and Colonel Bruen, and some other Landed Proprietors in the County of Carlow.

What Sort of Observations were they?
Very strong and very violent, denouncing those Landlords in the very strongest Terms. I forwarded those Speeches to a Member of Parliament at the Period when some Charges were made against Lord Beresford. I have endeavoured to find a Copy of them since, and could not find them. I can take upon myself to say that they were most inflammatory.

What Parish is Newton School in?
Newton School is in the Parish of Dunleckney; it is the Union of Dunleckney and Augha.

Is there a Protestant Clergyman living there?
There is.

Does he ever visit this School?
Not to my Knowledge. He spoke to me; I think he told me that he never visited the School.

What is his Name?
The Rev. John Braden.

Is he the Rector or the Curate?
He is the Perpetual Curate; I believe the Vicar of the Parish.

He takes no Interest in the School?
He does not; and the best Way I can account for that is, that he has a very flourishing School opposite his own House under the Kildare Place Society.

Did you go to that School?
I did.

Did you see any Roman Catholic Children there?
I did, several. In the Male School there were Thirteen Protestant Boys and Thirteen Roman Catholics, and it was one of the best conducted Schools I ever saw in the County of Carlow. In the Female School there were Twenty Protestant Girls and Eleven Roman Catholics, making altogether in the Two Schools, Fifty-seven.

When was it that there was this Number?
That was upon the Day I visited it; upon the 18th of March; the same Day that I visited Newton School.

Is that Kildare Place School in the Parish of which Mr. Phelan is the Parish Priest?
It is. The Union is called the United Parishes of Augha and Dunleckney. The Roman Catholic Parishes are differently described; but that Part in which the Kildare Street School is situated is within the Boundary of the Roman Catholic Parish.

Do you know whether Mr. Phelan prohibited the Children from going to the School?
I do not; but I have a Note here specially given to me by Mr. Braden,

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

and he describes to me several Roman Catholic Farmers of Respectability; One of them, whose Name is Cogan, a respectable Roman Catholic Farmer, offered to pay whatever Mr. Braden wished to require of him to allow his Children to be sent to his School, in preference to being sent to the Newton School; he could not take them, because they did not attend regularly.

Who were the chief landed Proprietors in that Union?
Lord Beresford, Colonel Bruen, and, I think, Mr. Walter Newton.

Do you know whether they were applied to for Land for the Purpose of building the National School?
I am not aware of it; but I am aware that Lord Beresford made most munificent Grants in that District to build not only Roman Catholic Chapels but gave very large Sums of Money to build Schools, and to assist them in every Way. Whether that was appropriated to build the National Schools I do not know, but I am aware that he made most extensive Grants to the Parishioners a few Years ago, as he does to all those who reside on his Estate.

Did you make any Representation upon the Subject of finding the Schools shut up to the National Board of Education?
I did not.

You were induced to abstain from doing that by the same Considerations that induced you not to make any Representations upon the Subject of the School at Carlow?
I was; and I would state that I did not think it would be useful.

Did you ever go there except to make Inquiry?
Never.

Do you know the Rev. Martin D'Oyle, who appears to be the Correspondent for the Schools of Graigue, Coppenagh, and Skeoughoosteen; is he a notorious Agitator?
He is; and I must beg to say in giving my Answer, that I think it only Justice to Mr. D'Oyle to state that he was at one Period One of the most exemplary Clergymen I heard of in the County. Till the Period of the Tithe Agitation he was a most exemplary Clergyman, and I have heard nothing against his private Character, but as to his Violence as a Political and a Tithe Agitator, it is now notorious.

But that Violence dates from the Question arising respecting Tithes?
It does.

Was this the Parish in which the Resistance to Tithes first took place?
In that Parish.

Who was the Person that first excited to this Resistance?
The Rev. Mr. D'Oyle.

Where did he begin that Excitement?
In his own Parish Chapel, and at various Meetings held in the Parish.

Did you ever hear him?
I did upon one Occasion, at the Period of Sir John Harvey's Visit to that Place by the Order of Government. I accompanied some Friends at the Time, and in the whole Parish the People all turned out upon the Mountains, in fact it continued for Three or Four Days in a State of Insurrection in the Parish; the Priest visited various Parts of the Parish, and I heard him deliver a Speech in his own Chapel from the Altar against the Tithes.

Did you hear him?
I did. In point of fact those Differences arose in Mr. D'Oyle's own Parish; the Tithes then belonged to the Rev. Mr. Allcock; and in a very inflammatory Speech he denounced the Clergyman, and ordered the People not to pay Tithes.

Do you recollect any of the inflammatory Matter of that Speech?
I do, perfectly well; he took a Portion of a certain Letter of Dr. Doyle's, and he stated to them that it was Dr. Doyle's Opinion that the People should not

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

pay Tithes, and he told them that they could very easily defeat the Law by allowing the Clergyman to distrain for Tithes, but that no Person would purchase the Property so distrained, and he inculcated on that Occasion passive Resistance. That was the first Instance in which I ever heard of its being preached in the Country.

You said he denounced this Protestant Clergyman; in what Way did he denounce him?

He denounced him as an old Man who was a Nuisance in the Parish, that he kept a very handsome Carriage at the Expense of the Poor, and that they would no longer support him in that Way; something of that Sort; the exact Words I cannot say; but I published at that Period frequent References to Mr. D'Oyle's own Speeches.

Did he say any thing against the Protestant Religion at that Time?

Nothing more than the usual Phrases, adopted with regard to Tithes, that the Church Establishment was a Nuisance. I do not think he said any thing as to doctrinal Matters, but against the Establishment.

What did he say?

He described the Church Establishment in Ireland as a Nuisance.

Is this the Reverend Martin D'Oyle that is referred to in this Affidavit? (*An Affidavit being shown to the Witness, contained in Page 45 of the Report of the Committee on the Collection and Payment of Tithes in* 1831-32.)

It is the same Person.

The Affidavit is delivered in and read, and is as follows:

"County of Kilkenny to wit. The Rev. Robert Lloyd, Curate of the Parish of Powerstown in said County, came this Day before me, One of His Majesty's Justices of Peace in the foresaid County, and maketh Oath, That on or about the 1st of December last he had a Conversation with a respectable Farmer named J. Farrell, who resides in said Parish, and that the said J. Farrell desired Deponent to furnish him with the Incumbent's Receipt, that he might pay the Amount of his Tithes, but in a few Days after the said J. Farrell told Deponent that the Rev. Martin D'Oyle, Parish Priest of Graigue and Powerstown, held a Station at his House, and desired the said J. Farrell on no account to pay the Amount of his Tithes. Shortly after this Deponent furnished him (J. F.) with the Incumbent's Receipt, and the said J. Farrell refused to pay; saying, that if he did so his House would be burnt, that he did not withhold his Tithes from Want of Money (showing at the same Time a Number of Bank Notes), but that the said Martin D'Oyle, P.P., had commanded him and all Landholders in said Parish not to pay their Tithes to the Incumbent or any other Person for him: That soon after this Deponent heard from several of the Inhabitants of the said Parish, who all concurred in their Testimony, that the said M. D'Oyle, P.P., had on many Occasions harangued the People from the Altar of the said Parish Chapel on the Subject of Tithes, threatening to denounce any Person who would dare to pay his Tithes, and holding forth for their Example the Conduct of the People of Graigue and Ullard, who assembled at Hurling-matches about the same Time: That soon after a Number of Persons assembled, some dressed in Female Clothing, and all armed with large Sticks, and surrounded the Glebe House of Powerstown Parish, and acted in a most clamorous Manner, crying, "Down with the Tithes," and so forth: That a great Number assembled soon after, Deponent believes about 6,000, and also surrounded the said Glebe House, Deponent's Residence, and were questioned by Deponent as to the Cause of their Meeting, &c. &c. and that One of them stood forward and spoke to the following Effect, "That they were determined no longer to support the Protestant Church; that a total Abolition, and not a Reduction, of Tithes was their Object:" That they then proceeded to the Tithe Proctor's House, and made, as Deponent heard from several, a similar Speech, threatening the said Tithe Proctor with Destruction if he did not give them a Promise never again to have any thing to do with the Collection of Tithes in the said Parish, and that the Tithe Proctor was obliged to comply with their Demands, and promise to give up in a short Time all Papers relating to the Tithes, and that the said Tithe Proctor said to Deponent that he was obliged to take with him Two Persons to see that he gave

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

said Papers to the Incumbent. Deponent further states, that shortly after all this, on his Way home, he has been several Times assailed, by Night and by Day, by the surrounding People; and that on or about the 20th of January last, on his Way home, he was attacked by a Man, who first demanded to know Deponent's Name, "and what he was," and on not being satisfied in his Questions cried out with an Oath, "You are a Minister; we will sweep you all off the Face of the Earth;" and then threw at Deponent a large Stone. The Deponent then called upon the Proprietor of the next House to come with him to assist in taking the Man who offered the Assault, but a Refusal was immediately given. That the Deponent, from the above-mentioned and several other Attacks made on him, and from the Spirit of the People in general, is apprehensive of his personal Safety, and is obliged to carry Fire-arms for his Protection. ROBT. LLOYD.

"Sworn before me this 25th of February 1831, L. G. Macdonnell, J.P. for said County."

Are there any other Protestant Schools in that Parish?
I do not know.

Do you know any thing of the Rev. Thomas Tyrrell, the Correspondent of the School of Tinryland?
I do.

Where is Tinryland?
Situated about Three or Four Miles from Carlow.

Is Mr. Tyrrell much known in Ireland?
Very well.

Do you know any thing of his being at any Time remarkable for any Violence of Language or Conduct?
I have known him since 1832.

Has he been often remarkable for Violence during that Time?
I should observe, that, even one Year since 1832, he has been remarkable for his Prudence; and a most exemplary Clergyman Mr. Tyrrell was till about the Year 1832, because I think it just to state that I knew no Priest in the Community so anxious to uphold the Rights of Property till the Year 1832. But since 1832 there has been a remarkable Change in his Conduct; he has been even more violent in denouncing the Landed Proprietors of the Kingdom than Mr. Mahir.

Can you give any Instance of any violent Speeches of his, at which you were present?
I hold in my Hand a Copy of a Speech reported by myself.

Do you mean to say in reading that Copy that it is an accurate Copy of the Report you made?
I do; I have the Notes, and I took them down most accurately.

Upon what Occasion was that Speech made?
Upon the Occasion of the late Election, upon the Hustings.

Will you read that Speech?

The Witness reads the same as follows:

"In one Thing, however, they all agree, and that is, Hatred to Lord Mulgrave and his Government. The Aristocracy were ashamed to appear themselves, and put Sir Thomas and Mr. Burton forward as a 'Coverslut' for their Vices. How can Sir Thomas Butler, a Whig, expect with the 'miserable Minority' to make Laws for the Majority? How did Sir Thomas Butler know that Reform was Revolution? Did he know better than the Ministry?" Here the Priest went into an historical Detail of the Persecution of the Irish since the Conquest in 1172, and that up to 1793 Ireland was treated as a conquered Province. Then in another Part of his Speech he said, "I now tell the Freeholders of this County if you vote for your Landlords you are guilty of a Misdemeanor, for by doing so you prostitute your Votes, for the Landlords have no more Right to them than they would have to use

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

your Wives and Daughters. The Landlords used to do so formerly, when you Catholics were in Chains; and I tell you more, they used to do so by the Laws of their own Creation. Will you send to Parliament Men who would fasten those Chains and renew the penal Laws? Tell the Landlords that before you are exterminated you will make them feel your Power. Let those who would re-enact the penal Laws be hurled from Place and Power; and do not forget we are Eight Millions. Colonel Bruen may depopulate Villages, burn Houses, and lay a sweeping Hand on that ill-fated County, yet there is a just God that will avenge it." Here he raised his Arm, and pointing to Colonel Bruen, he said, "Take care, Colonel; the Arm of an offended God is stretched out, the Tears of the Widow and the Shrieks of the Orphan are crying for Mercy, and will yet, in His good Time, bring down Vengeance upon you."

Was this Speech, the latter Part of it, addressed to Colonel Bruen in the Presence of the Populace?
It was.

Had the Populace previously shown any Inclination to Violence?
They had. They struck and knocked down several; they struck a Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. Vignolles, with their Bludgeons; the High Sheriff himself had a very narrow Escape of his Life; and at the Conclusion of this Speech a Riot occurred, and not less than Twenty Policemen were obliged to be brought into the Court House to preserve the Lives of Gentlemen in the Gallery.

Was that at the last Election this Year?
It was.

Have you ever visited the School of which Mr. Tyrrell is the Correspondent?
I have not.

Do you know in what Year it was established?
I do not.

Do you know that he is the Patron of any School?
I do, by seeing it in the Report.

Was he connected with the School at the Time when you consider his Conduct to have been decorous?
He may or he may not have been. Up to 1832 I consider Mr. Tyrrell's Conduct to have been quite unobjectionable. In 1832 he made some Speeches of a violent Nature; but I pass over those Speeches, and in 1835 I date the Commencement of his Agitation. I think he was the last of the Priests of the County that came out against the Landed Proprietors.

Was there any particular Circumstance at which you date his coming out against the Landed Proprietors?
Nothing particular, except the great Anxiety that some People had to overthrow the Church Establishment.

Was not there a Dissolution of Parliament in the Year 1832?
I cannot say at present.

Was it upon that Occasion that he exhibited Violence?
He did, and he also made a violent Speech at a public Dinner; but I pass those Things over.

Were you present at that Dinner?
No; I was present at the Speech at the Hustings.

Have not you known many Persons that are violent during Periods of Elections that are very quiet at other Times?
I have; but I am sorry to say it is not the Case with some of the Clergy that I know.

You mean Roman Catholic Clergy?
Yes.

What

Mr. T. H. Carroll

What do you call coming out against the Landed Proprietors?
I refer to a Variety of Topics introduced in his Speeches, such as stating that the Landlords let their Lands too high; that the Landlords are Absentees, and that there should be a very heavy Penalty imposed upon those Absentees; violently opposing them, denouncing them as Tyrants, and showing that they were Persons that have not fulfilled the Duties which they owe to their Tenants, and abusing them as Absentees. That is a Licence which I do not think any Priest is warranted in using; and they also abused the Landed Proprietary for the Exercise of their Influence with their own Tenants.

Do you know any thing of the Right Reverend Dr. Nolan, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Carlow?
I do.

Do you remember at any Time a Letter with his Signature to it being freely circulated in that Neighbourhood?
I do.

How long ago is that?
It was in January 1835.

Did he circulate any Letter about January 1834?
It was in January 1835, that was the First Election that Year. The general Election took place in January 1835. There is a Mistake in the Date as printed.

Here is a Letter purporting to be dated January 1834, do you mean that that is a Mistake, and that it was circulated in January 1835?
I do. I had a Number of it myself.

[A Letter is shown to the Witness.]

Will you look at this Letter and state whether that Letter was freely placarded through the Town of Carlow?
Yes; I recollect the Letter well.

Was that Letter ever denied to have proceeded from the Person whose Name it bears, "Edward Nolan, Bishop"?
Never. It was sent round to the Roman Catholic Clergy by way of Circular.

How do you know that?
I saw one of the Circulars, and I commented upon it, and I put it in Evidence myself. I believe it is an authentic Document.

Was this Passage in the Letter so circulated, dated 7th January 1834: "The best and dearest Interests, religious as well as political, of our People and Country are at this Moment at stake. A new Administration has been called into Power, avowedly for the Purpose of supporting the Temporalities of the Church by Law established, and the Principles of the Tory, Anti-reforming, or Conservative Party in England and Ireland"?
That was a Part of the Letter.

Was this a Part of the Letter: "The present General Election then is the most important that perhaps ever occurred in this Country, for on its Result depends the future Improvement, Peace, and Prosperity of Ireland, or the perpetual Continuance of the Poverty, Misery, and Degradation of her People. Shall we then stand by as idle Spectators of so momentous a Contest? We are so completely identified with our People in all their Interests and in all their Sufferings, I answer emphatically, No. The People stand in need of our Assistance in this Emergency, and we owe to them our most zealous Co-operation in an Object so evidently good as their peaceful and legal Endeavours to free themselves from the Thraldom of Conservative Oppression and the crying Grievances of an unjust and sanguinary Tithe System. We are bound to give them our Assistance by Instruction, Advice, Exhortation; and it is necessary to explain to the Electors the real Nature of the Question on which they are now called on to determine by their Votes. The Question before the Electors now is, not whether this or that Candidate be a Man of Wealth or limited Fortune, a Man of amiable Manners and private Worth or a haughty Aristocrat

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

and bad Landlord, a Man of mental Powers and literary Acquirements or a half educated Squire, but simply this, Will they by their Votes do all in their Power to support an Administration which is determined to check the Progress of salutary Improvement to all the Civil Institutions of the Empire, to uphold and perpetuate in Ireland the enormous Abuses of a Church Establishment from which the People never received aught but Evil, to place the Education of our Youth in the Hands of proselytizing Fanatics, and to deliver the Catholic Population again to the Domination of the old Ascendancy Faction?" Was that a Part of the Letter?

It was. Perhaps it may be necessary to state the Reason why I recollect that so well. Mr. Thomas Finn, a Roman Catholic Gentleman, Brother to the Member of Parliament, consulted me about that Document. He placed in my Hands a great Number of Documents showing that Dr. Nolan and those Roman Catholic Bishops who wrote in that violent Way had violated their own solemn Pledges and Promises previous to passing the Relief Bill; and upon the Occasion of that Document appearing, I published those Contradictions, or at least their former Opinions, to show how inconsistently Dr. Nolan acted. That is the Reason I know that Document so well.

You were desired upon a former Occasion to obtain a Copy of The Leinster Independent which had relation to a Speech said to have been made by Dr. Nolan; have you got one?

I have.

Is this the Paper of which you spoke on a former Day as being patronized by the College at Carlow?

It is.

That being a College for the Education of the Roman Catholic Priests?

Yes.

Does Dr. Nolan the Bishop live near to Carlow?

Within a very short Distance of it.

Is this Paper freely circulated in Carlow and its Neighbourhood?

Very extensively.

Where is it printed?

In the Town of Carlow.

What is the Date of it?

The 21st of January 1837.

Is there any Part of it that you wish to read, as illustrative of what you have said of Dr. Nolan?

This purports to be a Speech delivered at a Dinner given to Mr. O'Connell in Carlow upon that Occasion, in the Month of January 1837.

Were you present when that Speech was made?

I was not.

Did you ever hear that this Report of the Proceedings of that Day was at all contradicted or complained of?

So far from contradicting or complaining of it, several Gentlemen who were at the Dinner, one of them in particular, told me that Dr. Nolan delivered this Speech; and I have no Doubt, if I can be convinced by any moral Evidence, that he did deliver this Speech. This Speech was circulated not only in this Newspaper, but it was circulated most extensively in Handbills through the whole County and in the very Town.

Will you read that Speech?

The Witness reads the same, as follows:

"I beg leave to return my best Thanks for the Manner in which my Name has been received. Mr. O'Connell has truly stated the Reason why I thus appear in a Political Assembly, and I think the same Feelings which actuate me belong to the rest of the Clergy of Ireland. Mr. O'Connell has not however stated the Reasons fully. We are compelled by the Necessity of the Times

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

to appear amongst the People, and seek for Justice for our beloved Country. We however attend on this particular Occasion as much to give a hearty Welcome to the Man to whom we owe so much as to testify our Approbation of the Principles upon which are based Justice to Ireland and universal Happiness to Mankind. Mr. O'Connell, in speaking of himself, said he was but a Feather thrown up, which merely showed the Way the Wind blew; but I will venture to say that he is a Man raised up by God to work out the Regeneration of our Country. It is for the People that he is working; and we pray God to direct him and bless his Efforts, and continue that Vigour of Body and Mind which are necessary to him in the arduous Contest in which he is engaged. It is with great Pleasure I appear amongst you this Evening to acknowledge that I am united with the People in the Cause of Ireland, and to proclaim that, with the Blessing of the Most High, we cannot be separated from the People. It would be our Wish, and it would best accord with our sacred Duties, to live retired from Scenes of Political Agitation; but there are Occasions when we must come forward for the sake of those whose Interests are dear to us, and we would be ungrateful if we deserted or withheld from them our Assistance and Advice. We have no individual Interests of our own; our Sympathies and Solicitudes are enlisted on behalf of our faithful Flocks who have been ever true to their Pastors and the Religion of our Fathers. I may be allowed to remark, that when Catholic Emancipation was granted, and the Career of honourable Ambition was open to Men of all Creeds, (chiefly, I will say, by the Exertions of our illustrious Guest,) it was the Determination of the Catholic Bishops and Priesthood to withdraw from Political Excitement and follow the peaceful and secluded Paths of our sacred Calling; but again have we been forced into a new Political Existence, not by Mr. O'Connell, but by the Insult and the Injustice that have been done to our Country. We did not seek to appear in public; we have been forced to it, because we are identified with the Interests of our People, who have been insulted and stigmatized. Our Object is to secure their Happiness and the general Prosperity of our Country. We have been with the People in Weal and Woe; they have been faithful to us, and it could not be expected at this Period that we could desert them. This is our Crime; that we are with the People, and for this we are abused. Mr. O'Connell says he is the best abused Man in the Empire; the Catholic Clergy may say they are the best abused Class of Men in the Empire. But the Abuse of Newspapers or of bad Men will never separate us from the People; nor will the Promises or Hopes of temporal Emoluments ever tear asunder those sacred Ties by which we are bound. I do not know if it were a pretended Friend or an Enemy to our Religion who suggested the Plan of a State Provision for the Catholic Clergy; we will never consent to be the paid Servants of the Crown. I am certain that the Priesthood of Ireland with their Bishops repudiate such a Measure. We are firm Upholders, inasmuch as we are bound to support Peace and good Order, knowing that all Power is from above; we are therefore, through the Dictates of Religion and for the Love of that Peace which our Redeemer came to preach upon Earth, the true Supporters of Government and of good Order. We support cheerfully the present Government and the present Ministry, because they have shown a Determination to do Justice to the People of Ireland. We would, in my Opinion, even act unjustly and in opposition to those Principles which are fast gaining Ground over the World if we were to accept Payment from the Government; it would be taking out of Taxes paid by Men to many of whom we would render no Value; the Protestants and Dissenters of the Three Kingdoms would pay a great Portion of this Tax, and it would be unjust to take it from them; we will continue to be supported by the free Offerings of the People, which is the true Apostolic Practice. The Right Reverend Prelate again declared that the Insults offered to his Country had reluctantly forced him to join the moral and peaceable Struggle which was at present being made to gain Justice for his Country."

You visited several Schools last March?
I did.

Do you recollect how many you visited?
I think about Six or Seven.

Mr. T. H. Carroll.

Every one of them was in the Month of March?
Yes.

How came you to go just at that Time; were you desired to go by any body?
I was not; I went freely myself for the Purpose of inquiring into the Operation of the System.

With a view to report to the Committee?
I had at the Time a great Number of Documents submitted to me from various Parts, describing the Abuses of the System; and I determined, before I would use those Documents, to see whether those Abuses existed or not; and accordingly I went.

Did you receive those Documents recently before you commenced those Visits?
I did; and for some Time past too.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

JOHN COLQUHOUN Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

In your former Examination you stated that you visited several Schools in the Province of Ulster and in other Parts of Ireland, and you said that you had given great Attention to the Subject of Education, and especially the National System in Ireland; have you drawn any Conclusions from the Facts that came to your Knowledge, on inspecting those Schools, relative to the Manner in which the National System of Education works in Ireland?
I have drawn some Conclusions.

Will you state some of the Conclusions at which you arrived?
I was anxious to observe how the Objects which were contemplated by the National Board of Education, and which they professed in their Report, were carried into effect.

What did you understand those Objects to be?
I understood those Objects, taking them from their own Reports, to be Four principal Objects: the first, an Education leading to a more general and profitable Perusal of the Scriptures.

Upon what Part of their Reports or Documents do you found that Conclusion?
In Page 124 of the published Volume containing the Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, and some Extracts from the Evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1835-36, I find a Portion of the Evidence of One of the Commissioners before the Committee of the House of Commons; the Commissioner I mean is Mr. Blake; and I find that Mr. Blake quotes as an authoritative Document a Portion of the Preface to the First Number of Scripture Extracts issued by the Board. Mr. Blake says, "I beg to call the Attention of the Committee to the following Passages: 'These Selections are offered, not as a Substitute for the sacred Volume itself, but as an Introduction to it; and they have been compiled in the Hope of their leading to a more general and more profitable Perusal of the Word of God.'" That, therefore, I take as one of the Objects which the Commissioners had in view; that their System of Education would be such as to lead "to a more general and more profitable Perusal of the Word of God."

And you think from your Observation that the System does not work to that End?
It appears to me that the System can hardly, by any Possibility, work to that End in the Way in which it is at present administered. If any one was desirous that his Child should read the Scriptures, it would seem rather a peculiar Mode to place him in the Hands of a Tutor who should during a certain Portion of the Day read with him Passages of the Scriptures without any

any Sort of Explanation whatsoever, the Scriptures being in the Opinion of all, and especially in the Opinion of Roman Catholics, a Book of extreme Difficulty; and it is quite clear that no Explanation of them can be offered, because the Moment any Explanation is offered the Party offering it will come upon some of the debatable Ground, which is prohibited by the Board and by the System of National Education. The most essential Doctrines of Christianity are Doctrines upon which Protestants and Roman Catholics differ, and therefore the Moment that the Master of a School enters upon that Ground he is entering upon one prohibited by the System of National Education.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

You say that the most essential Doctrines of Christianity are Doctrines upon which the Protestants and Roman Catholics differ; what are those essential Doctrines of Christianity upon which the Roman Catholics and Protestants differ?

For example, the Doctrine that lies at the Root of Christianity, and which is a Protestant Doctrine, the Belief that Salvation comes by Christ alone; a Roman Catholic obviously will differ from that, because he will say that Works are to be trusted in, and that the Church is the Authority by whom those Works are to be set forth; you have immediately a very wide Difference arising between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Teacher upon that Doctrine.

Do you take upon yourself to assert that the Roman Catholics do not hold that Salvation is only had through the Merits of Christ?

I think I can quote to your Lordships a Variety of Passages which would show that at all events they hold a very different View upon that Subject from that which Protestants do; I think it would probably lead to a very long Discussion if I were to enter upon the Proof of that Matter. I should state generally, as a Matter of pretty considerable Notoriety, that upon that Doctrine, and upon several other Doctrines, Protestants and Roman Catholics do differ.

You asserted that they differed upon the most essential Doctrines of Christianity, therefore you were asked what are the essential Doctrines upon which they differ; you stated, the Doctrine that Salvation was only to be obtained through the Merits of Christ; upon which you were asked whether you will take upon yourself to assert that the Roman Catholics hold that Salvation can be obtained otherwise than through the Merits of Christ?

As couched in those Words, it is clear that the Roman Catholics would agree with the Protestants that without the Merits of Christ Salvation cannot be attained.

Do you mean that the great Difference is that the Protestant Church of England holds that Justification is by Faith alone in the Merits of Christ, while the Roman Catholics say that Justification is by Works?

Is by Works as well as by Faith; that, as it has now been expressed, exactly conveys my Meaning; it shows the fundamental Difference upon that Point as upon many others. I could quote Passages in proof of this from a Book recently published by Mr. Baptist Noel, who has quoted largely from popular Roman Catholic Works, in which he exhibits Differences, which strike him as vital Differences, between the Roman Catholic Books of popular catechismal Instruction and what are known to be the established Doctrines of the Churches of England and Scotland and the other Protestant Churches.

Have you looked into the Scripture Lessons published by the Board?

I have looked into them.

Are you aware of any Part of those Scripture Lessons which has especial Reference to this Doctrine of Justification by Faith, as distinguished from Justification by Faith with Works?

I could not say that I have looked to them with that View.

Is there any other Reason that you would wish to give for thinking that the System has failed in this its First Object?

I was proceeding to state that Explanations of the Scriptures could not be allowed, because Explanations would lead to Differences of Opinion, and those

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Differences of Opinion are, upon the Principle of the Board, excluded. Now I can conceive the Master saying to the Child, "I am not at liberty to explain to you this Book of Scripture, but this Book is essentially the Book of God, by which you are to rule your Life, and from which you are to derive your Faith." I can understand this System; and though certainly it would seem to me a very imperfect System of Education by which the Teacher was not to explain the Book which was held to be the most important, and of which you desire to convey a correct Understanding, yet still if the Teacher were at liberty to say, "This is of all others a Book of the highest Importance, and you are to study this, and to rule your Life by it, and to derive your Faith from it,"—I can understand then that the Children might receive a very considerable Impression, and might be led to study the Book at home. But it is quite clear that on the Principles of the Roman Catholic Religion that cannot be done, because you immediately introduce the Right of private Judgment upon Scripture, which is notoriously inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; and that it is inconsistent with it I can prove to your Lordships by Reference to Statements made by one of the Commissioners himself, Dr. Murray, and by Dr. Kelly and Dr. Doyle, all of them Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, and who convey therefore authoritatively and recently the prevailing Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church upon that Subject.

Do you think that this is more an Objection to the National System of Education than to any other System of joint Education of Roman Catholics and Protestants?

I do not know any System of joint Education of Roman Catholics and Protestants founded upon the same Principle. We have a joint Education in Scotland between Roman Catholics and Protestants, but that joint Education is conducted on the Principle that the Scriptures are to be read, and are to be explained by a Protestant Master.

Then any System of Education that would exclude Explanation of Scripture by a Protestant Master in deference to the Objections of the Roman Catholic would be equally open to this Objection, in your Opinion, as the National System?

I think it certainly would. Then I may be allowed to add, it being admitted to be the Case, that the Roman Catholics do not allow a Reference to the Scripture as the Book from which a Child is to derive his Instruction. As the Perusal does not take place in the School upon any of the ordinary Principles by which Perusal is made useful (as no Explanation is allowed), and not taking place out of the School by any Impression made upon the Mind of the Child by the Master referring to the Book as a Book of Authority, I am at a loss to see how the Object which the Commissioners have in view can possibly be obtained; for in the School the System excludes the profitable Perusal of the Word of God, and out of School it leaves no Impression upon the Mind of the Child by which he will go home to pursue that Perusal. I believe, therefore, it will be found in Practice that there is not that general and profitable Perusal of the Word of God which the Commissioners profess, but which I think the working of the Schools will not show.

Do not you think that Part of the Evil may be counteracted by the Circumstance of separate Days for Religious Education upon the Principle of the National Schools?

I confess I do not, for Reasons which will afterwards appear in one of those Points which I intend to explain fully under one of the Heads which I have just stated to the Committee.

What is the Second Object that you would state to be declared by the Commissioners as their Object in this System?

The Second Object which they profess is that of Education based on Religion. I will read to the Committee the Words in which they express that from the Second Report of the Commissioners, Page 14. in the Pamphlet: in the National Schools "the Importance of Religion is constantly impressed upon the Minds of the Children through Works calculated to promote good Principles and fill the Heart with a Love of Religion, but which are so compiled as not to clash with the Doctrines of any particular Class of Christians. The Children

Children are thus prepared for those more strict Religious Exercises which it is the peculiar Province of the Ministers of Religion to superintend or direct, and for which stated Times are set apart in each School, so that each Class of Christians may thus receive separately such Religious Instruction, and from such Persons, as their Parents or Pastors may approve or appoint. The National Schools are therefore founded on Principles which conscientious Men of different Religious Denominations may and do embrace." And then, in the Report of 1836, at Page 58, they say, "We are now endeavouring to bring Children of all Denominations together from their Infancy in Feelings of Charity and Good-will, to make them regard each other, not as belonging to rival Sects, but as Subjects of the same King and Fellows in the same Redemption, so that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the Way of Truth, and may hold the Faith in Unity of Spirit, in the Bond of Peace," &c. It is clear from that Statement that the Commissioners contemplate an Education which will be strictly a Christian Education, or at least which will lead to Christian Impressions upon the Minds of the Children; "that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the Way of Truth." Now it appears to me that upon the Principle which the Board adopts that Object cannot be attained, because, again, the Moment that the Master proceeds to teach any of the leading Doctrines of Christianity there will arise the same vital Objection as in the former Case; he will get upon debatable Ground. If, for example, he brings forward the Doctrine of Salvation by Christ and the Divinity of Christ to the Mind of the Child, he is bringing forward a Topic which is clearly objectionable to the Unitarian; and as Mr. Blake says "any Religious Work is forbidden which may be objectionable to any particular Class of Christians," consequently any Work or any View which is objectionable to an Unitarian must be excluded; and that which is the fundamental Principle of the Church of England or of Scotland must clearly be excluded, because if the Master bring forward that general Principle he is immediately treading upon the conscientious Feelings of the Unitarian; and he must therefore drop out of this System of teaching that which the Churches of England and Scotland, whether erroneously or not I do not say, look upon as a fundamental and absolutely indispensable Doctrine of Christianity. Then if, in order to avoid this, he takes the Bible, and refers the Child to the Bible, again he is met, as in the former Case, by the fundamental Objection of the Roman Catholic Priest to the Bible, and he must not allow the Child to apply his own Judgment and derive his own Faith from the Bible, because that is contrary to the Principle of the Roman Catholic Church. So that neither can he bring forward what as Members of the Churches of England and Scotland we are in the habit of considering the indispensable Doctrines of Christianity, nor must he press a Reference to the Bible, which is the Fountain from which the Doctrines of Christianity are to be derived. There is, however, another Point which occurs to me as very remarkable, as to the Meaning which the Board of Education attach to the Word "Religion." In the Report of the Commissioners of 1835, Page 14, the Board state, "the Children of the Schools are thus prepared," thus—by the System of National Education—prepared, "for those more strict religious Exercises which it is the peculiar Province of the Ministers of Religion to superintend or direct;" so that from that Statement of the Board it is clear that the Schools are considered by the Commissioners as training and preparatory Schools, to bring forward Children and prepare them for those more strict religious Exercises which they are to receive from the Pastors of their peculiar Persuasion. Then it is clear that in that Way Three Fourths of the Children in the National Schools, as the great Majority are Roman Catholics, are training in order to be handed over to the Religious Instruction of the Roman Catholic Priesthood. Now, that Religious Instruction consists (and, if your Lordships wish, I shall quote sufficient Proof) of Matters which appear to us as Protestants any thing but Religious Instruction; Instruction which it would not become me to characterize strongly, but Instruction, certainly, which we protest against as erroneous: for example, the Doctrine of Purgatory, the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, the Doctrine of the Adoration, or at all events of respectful Homage, to Images; all these are Doctrines which we protest against as Superstition, and which the Roman Catholic Priests teach as essential Doctrines of Christianity. For example, there are Three Books, which I hold in my Hand, which are in

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

universal Use in the Sunday Schools of the Roman Catholics; the One is the Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, the Second an Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, the Third is the General Catechism revised by Dr. Doyle. The Two last are thus characterized on the Title Page, "Revised by the Right Rev. James Doyle, and prescribed by him to be used in the united Dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin." In the Dedication of the Catechism addressed by Dr. Doyle to the Children, he begs them "to accept it as the best Gift he can offer to you; be diligent in learning it at home, in your Schools, but especially on Sundays under the Eyes of your Clergy," &c.; and of the former, he says in his Dedication addressed to the Members of the Society of the Christian Doctrine, "Finding that you had introduced it (the Abridgment) generally into the Schools of Catechetical Instruction." Both these Books Dr. Doyle characterizes as the Sources of Religious Instruction for Roman Catholic Children; and both of them are in fact used in the Sabbath Schools of Roman Catholic Chapels throughout Ireland at the present Hour. These Books I therefore refer to as containing the Religious Instruction supplied to the Children of their Persuasion by the Roman Catholic Priests. Now, we have in these brought forward the Doctrine of the Mediation of Saints, Prayers to the Virgin Mary,—very long and full Prayers, the Adoration of Relics and holy Places, the Adoration of Saints, the Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Now those Doctrines, whether correctly or not, we as Protestants protest against as the greatest Errors; yet these are Doctrines which are taught by the Roman Catholic Priest to the Children on the Sunday in the course of Religious Instruction, for which the Board are preparing the Children, according to their own Statement.

Is there any other Reason you would wish to give with respect to the Second Object of the Board?

I would only say upon this Point, that when the Board say, as they do in their Report of 1836, Page 4, "To it we also refer for a complete Refutation of the Statement that the System has been repudiated by one great important Section of the Nation," that it does appear to me that if Protestants entertain a conscientious Preference still for the ordinarily received Doctrines of Protestantism, and if they persist still in their Protest against what they consider the flagrant Errors of the Roman Catholic Religion, it does seem to me not surprising that the National System, which trains up, according to the Statement of the Commissioners, the Children of Ireland for the peculiar Exercises of the Roman Catholic Religion, should be repudiated by that great and important Section of the Nation which is called the Protestant.

Do you call the giving to the Children such Religious Information that they may with Advantage receive the Religious Instruction of their peculiar Teachers, namely, the Roman Catholics, a training them for the Purpose of receiving the Tenets of the Roman Catholic Religion?

I merely state what the Commissioners themselves have stated, that the Children are "thus," by the System of National Education, "prepared for those more strict Religious Exercises which it is the peculiar Province of the Ministers of Religion to superintend or direct." I have proved to your Lordships that the peculiar Doctrines stated and pressed by the Roman Catholic Clergy are those which we protest against as Fables and Errors; we may be wrong and they may be right, but we as Protestants protest against them as Fables and Errors, and they as Roman Catholics teach them constantly to the Children upon the Sunday; yet, by the Statement of the Commissioners, their System of Education is such that it is a training School, preparing the Children for those Religious Exercises which they are to receive from the Roman Catholic Priests.

What is the Third Object of the Board, which you consider them to have stated as their Object?

The Third Object is an Education promoting Morality, as they say in their Report of 1835, Page 15. They speak of it as "a Moral Education;" they say, "the Schoolmasters must be highly beneficial in promoting Morality." Mr. Kelly, in Page 139, speaks of the Schools "as Schools of Moral Instruction."

In

In what respect do you think the Board has failed in attaining this Object? *J. Colquhoun, Esq.*

It appears to me that Morality cannot be taught without some Motive; and that the Motives which Protestant Schoolmasters are in the habit of pressing, (which are the Will of God as revealed in Scripture, Obedience to that Will as revealed in Scripture, the Love of Christ as set forth in Scripture,) that those are Motives which, for the Reasons I have already stated, must be struck out and most rigorously prohibited in the Course of Instruction given in the National Schools. If the Master was to press any of those Motives, he would immediately lay himself open to the Objection stated in the former Answer, of offending against the conscientious Scruples either of the Unitarian or of the Roman Catholic, and consequently Morality must be divested of those Motives which as Protestants we consider to be the only Motives likely to act upon the Mind of the Child. Then what remains? Dry Precept; the Command to do certain Things, without any Motive at all. That seems to me to be a System of Education not consistent with sound Philosophy nor with practical Sense. We know that the Passions of a Child in all Classes of Life are strong, but we are aware that in the higher Classes of Life they are placed under some restraining Influences, as the Opinion of the Class of Society in which the Child is placed, a Sense of Honour, &c. But all those Motives are entirely taken away from the common People; no such Motives prevail among them; it is with them the rude strong Impulse of sensual Passion on the one Side; and on the other Side what is put against it? Dry abstract Precept of the Master, who says, you shall not steal, or you shall not get drunk. In that Case it is quite clear that the sensual Passion of the Child will at once overbear the dry abstract Precept of the Master. The Board puts forward a System of abstract Precept which must be inefficient to control the Passions of a strong sensitive Peasantry; and the Question is, which is to prevail? The dry Precepts of the Master which may be set up and placarded round the Walls of the School, or the strong and intense Passions of the Child. It is obvious that the Passions of the Child will overbear the abstract Precept, and that a Morality without Motive is equivalent to no Morality at all. Upon this Point, in order to show that I have not spoken from a merely theoretical View, I would beg to quote the Opinion of one of the Commissioners, whom I am happy in this Case entirely to coincide with. Dr. Murray, before the Committee of 1825, Page 422, when asked with regard to teaching the Moral Parts of Scripture without the Religious Part, says, "We seldom separate Moral from Religious Instruction; we consider them as united together; the Moral Part of Scripture we consider as enforced by the Religious Part of it; we wish them to go together;" an Opinion in which I entirely coincide. And in order to show that the Morality inculcated under such a System cannot be very effective, I would quote Mr. Burnett's Opinion before the same Committee of 1825. Mr. Burnett says, "A much greater Prominency is given in their Sermons," speaking of the Roman Catholic Priests, "to the Rites and Ceremonies of their Church than to the Moral Duties of Life or the peculiar Principles of Christianity. They are led to insist on those Rites and Ceremonies from which their Revenues come, in such a Way as to produce on the Minds of the People the Impression that the Rites of the Church are paramount to Moral Duties." So that on the one hand the Commissioners set up dry moral Precept which can have no Effect, and on the other hand they leave them to the Instruction of the Priesthood on Sunday; which Instruction certainly does not supply the Defect which exists, because it does not turn principally or at all upon Moral Duties, but principally, if not solely, upon the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

Is there any Fourth Object that the Board seems to you to profess?

The Fourth Object of the Board is an Education which promotes Union and Harmony among different Sects.

Is it your Opinion that the National System does not tend to the Attainment of this great Object?

That is my Opinion. I will state first how the Board expresses itself upon the Subject. In the Report of 1834, in Page 7, the Object is stated: "To train up and unite through it the Youth of the Country together, whatever their Religious Differences may be, in Feelings and Habits of Attachment and Friendship towards each other, and thus to render it the Means of promoting

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Charity and Good-will amongst all Classes of the People." And in the Report of 1836, Page 58: "We are endeavouring to give a new Stamp to the rising Generation of the Country, to bring Children of all Denominations together from their Infancy in Feelings of Charity and Good-will, to make them regard each other, not as belonging to rival Sects, but as Subjects of the same King and Fellows in the same Redemption; so that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the Way of Truth, and may hold the Faith in Unity of Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and in Righteousness of Life. This is the End we seek; we feel that we have so pursued it as to entitle ourselves to public Confidence and Support."

Will you state in what respect you think they have failed?

I think they have failed, because, as I have just mentioned, the Board commit the Children to the peculiar Religious Instructions of the Priests of the Church of Rome. Now the peculiar Religious Instructions of the Priests of the Church of Rome are not of a Character to induce Harmony and Union between different Sects.

Of course you mean to say that they commit only the Roman Catholic Children to the Priests of the Church of Rome?

I mean of course to confine my Remark to the Roman Catholic Children, who are, however, Four Fifths of the whole. In one of the Catechisms which I have referred to I find the Question put, "Is there but One true Church?—There is but One. How do you call it?—The Roman Catholic Church. Are all obliged to be of this Church?—Yes. Why?—Because no one can be saved out of it;" and then it is afterwards said that those who are not Members of the Church so defined, which is specially defined to be the Church of which the Pope is the Head, are Heretics and Infidels.

What do you take that from?

From the general Catechism in common Use, recommended by Dr. Doyle.

Is that sanctioned by the Board for separate Religious Instruction?

I do not know whether it is sanctioned by the Board, but it is a Book in common Use at this Day by the Priests of Ireland.

Is that Dr. Doyle's Catechism?

It is.

Do you understand that to be the Book that is mentioned here in the List of Books that are employed in the Schools in separate Religious Instruction, with the Sanction and Approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious Persuasion?

Yes; Dr. Doyle's Catechism is One of them.

Is there any other Proof that you would wish to give upon this Subject?

I would mention more particularly, with regard to the Catechism, that Dr. Murray, Dr. Kelly, and Dr. Doyle state, in the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Education, that after Mass the Children are instructed in the Chapel by religious Persons in these Catechisms: Dr. Murray states that they teach the Children the Catechism, and Dr. Doyle states the same. Now these Catechisms bring forward always the Doctrine of exclusive Salvation, the Doctrine that those who are not Members of the Church are Heretics and will be damned; that there is no Possibility of their being saved.—Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, p. 21, 22, 24, 25; Catechism, p. 20, 21, 28, 29. Consequently, if on the one hand the Object of the Board is to unite the Children in Love and Harmony, and on the other hand they are training them up for the Instruction of that Body of Clergy who teach them Doctrines so exasperating and so widening as those, I must confess I think the pacific Instructions of the Board will be much more than counterbalanced by the exterminating and inflammatory Doctrines taught on the Sunday; and that consequently the Idea of Union and Harmony arising from such a System of Education is one not likely to be realized.

Is there any other Object that the Board professes to seek?

The Board professes to expect that they will accomplish an efficient and useful System of popular Education. The Board say, in the Report, Page 58,

"We are endeavouring to give a new Stamp to the rising Generation of the Country," and so forth, as I have quoted in the former Case. *J. Colquhoun, Esq.*

Have you any Reason to give why you think the Board has failed in that?

The Objection that occurs to me to the Attainment of the Object is, that One of the Principles acted upon by the Board is opposed to it. They consider as the First Class of Applications most deserving their Attention the Applications made by the Protestant and Roman Catholic Clergymen; those are the Applications which they most favour, and failing one of those, the Application of One Clergyman along with a Layman; and the most numerous Class of Applications in point of fact have been made by Roman Catholic Clergymen along with Laymen either Roman Catholic or of the Protestant Persuasion. The Person who is the Patron of the School, and naturally influences, is the Person who has applied for the School; and, as I have stated in several Cases that came under my own Observation, the Board are in the habit of communicating through the Patron of the School, and taking their general Impressions of the School from him; and not only so, but the Board will for the same Reasons be inclined to take his Recommendation of the Master who will be placed in the School; consequently the Masters who will be placed in the Schools will generally be such as are acceptable to these Patrons; in fact they will be generally such as are acceptable to the Roman Catholic Priesthood. It arises, therefore, as a Question of great Interest, what is the View of the Roman Catholic Priesthood with regard to Education? What are their Objects and Wishes in this respect? Now I am quite ready to admit that the Roman Catholic Priesthood have in view a very general System of Education in their Sense of the Word, but I do not think they have in view a general System of Education in the ordinary Sense of the Word. In all Countries where the Roman Catholic Church is dominant there exists a great Number of Schools. Dr. Wiseman, in his Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons last Year, has stated that in Rome there are Schools in almost every Section of the City and in almost every Portion of the Roman Territory; and he has given that as an Illustration of the Principle of the Roman Catholic Church. Dean M'Namara, when asked upon the same Subject, stated it as a Fact not to be contradicted, that the Roman Catholic Church did promote very generally a System of Education. Now, admitting the Fact which Dr. Wiseman has stated, that there are a great many Schools in Rome, we must understand the Nature of those Schools; Schools, not for calling out the Intellect of the Children, because, confessedly, the Romans, the Neapolitans, and all the Peasantry of the Countries where the Roman Catholic Religion prevails are singularly uneducated. We have then this remarkable Fact that in the Roman Catholic Countries throughout Christendom there is an immense Mass of apparent Education, and that alongside of that there is the grossest popular Ignorance. In Italy the illiterate Character of the Peasantry is notorious to every Traveller; and no one who has gone through Italy, and has investigated the State of the Peasantry, can fail to have been struck with the Fact that he finds a small Portion only who can read or write. How then are we to explain this apparent Anomaly? On the one hand Dr. Wiseman states with perfect Correctness that there are Schools scattered all over Rome and over the Roman Territory, and he ought to have added throughout Roman Catholic Countries, and the other Fact that the Peasantry scarcely ever are able to read or write. The Fact is explained at once when we enter the Schools, and see what is the Character of the Education; there is a great deal of committing to Memory of Catechisms, of such Catechisms as I have quoted; there is a great deal of Precept inculcated, as Mr. Burnett has said, with regard to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; but there is neither Intellectual nor Moral Education, neither the Education which will quicken their Faculties or improve the Heart — there is no such Thing; and it is notorious that in France, when, under the Domination of the Roman Catholic Church, an Attempt was made to introduce the Lancastrian System of Education,—the System of mutual Instruction, that Attempt was resisted, and it was and is now successfully resisted in Italy; and this Fact is admitted by Dr. Wiseman. And why? Because the Lancastrian System of Education is one of a very quickening and exhilarating Kind, and calculated to call out very rapidly the Faculties of the Children; that therefore is a System

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

of Education against which the Church of Rome sets its Face as utterly inconsistent with its Safety. As an Illustration I may mention that the Freres Ignorantins, who had for a long Time the sole Superintendence of popular Education in France, never introduced any Improvements in Education into any of the Schools, and kept the Children grossly ignorant and superstitious; and it was only after the Regime of Napoleon had forced upon France the Lancastrian System of Instruction that they were then obliged to modify their Plans and follow in the Wake of this, and to improve the System of Instruction in their Schools. In Spain at this Moment the Education is of the lowest possible Description in point of Quality, and it is almost entirely, as it is in Rome, in the Hands of the Priesthood. Nuns, Friars, Jesuits are the Persons who have the Charge of Education both in Italy and in Spain; and in those Schools of Spain the Education, as Monsieur Jounés, a French Writer who has investigated the Subject, states, those Schools are entirely occupied in inculcating the Dogmas of the Church and keeping up the slavish Fears of the People, not in communicating any Knowledge either intellectual or moral, with a view to cultivate the Faculties or improve the Feelings of the Children. Such then is the Fact in the Schools of those Countries in which the Roman Catholic Clergy are predominant; the same was the Case in Ireland in the Hedge Schools. The Hedge Schools, as Mr. Grant, now Lord Glenelg, stated before the House of Commons, were Schools in which the lowest possible State of Morals was observed, in which the most immoral Books were admitted, and in which Intellectual Education was at the lowest possible Scale; and Mr. Burnett states the same with regard to Ireland; and he lays the Charge of those immoral Books being read and of intellectual Works being excluded at the Door of the Roman Catholic Priesthood. He says, before the Commissioners in 1828, Page 299, "The great Evil of Ireland is the Ignorance of the Peasantry. The Obstacles to Education arise chiefly from the Roman Catholic Priesthood; the People are disposed to receive Education, but the Priests check that Disposition. The People wish to receive and read the Scriptures; the Priests prohibit Attendance at the Schools where the Bible is read. The People are very unwilling to obey, but the Priests compel them by threatening them with the Loss of Sacraments. The immoral Books read in the Hedge Schools are never discountenanced by the Priests, who could have removed them at once if they had been so disposed. Every Species of Education has been opposed by the Priests of the South of Ireland; they do nothing to promote it, except in Towns where, from the Efforts of Protestants in the Cause of Education, they feel themselves compelled to do something, but in the Country it is altogether neglected." He says again, "I should not fairly represent Catholicity did I not add that there are Catholic Books in general circulated in the Country that are subversive of the very first Principles of Morality and Religion. It is well known by the Priesthood that these Books are in Circulation; they could prevent their Circulation as they prevent in a great Degree the Circulation of the Scriptures; they have never made any Attempt to prevent their Circulation."

Whose Authority are you reading?

I am quoting the Evidence of Mr. Burnett, an Independent Minister very hostile to the Established Church, and whose Authority therefore I take to be on this Side good, because at least he is not a Witness partial to the Religious Establishments of this Country.

Is he more partial to the Catholic Establishments?

I find him at this Moment in strong Political Alliance with the Roman Catholic Party, and I presume that his Political Feelings would give him a Bias in favor of the Roman Catholics.

The Question does not apply to his Political but to his Religious Feeling. Do you, from what you know of the Independent Creed, consider that Creed to be less hostile to the Catholic Church than to the Establishment of the Church of England?

The Independent Creed I take to be the same in general Doctrines as the Creed of the Established Church, and, therefore, of course there will be the same Hostility to the Roman Catholic Doctrines that there is amongst the Members of the Established Church.

In

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

In making the Observations which you recently made, as applied to the State and the System of Instruction in the Roman Catholic Schools in the Ecclesiastical States, where the Roman Catholic Church, as you describe it, is dominant, do you mean to apply those Observations also to the Roman Catholic Schools in other Parts of the Continent where the Bulk of the Population is Roman Catholic, and where the Masters are Roman Catholic, but where the Religion is not, in a legal Sense, dominant?

Decidedly; wherever there is Influence in the Hands of the Roman Catholic Church that Influence I take to be always used in One Direction, namely, to draw into Places which they term Schools Assemblages of Children, and to impress the Minds of these Children with a most deep Respect for the Church of Rome, but where a System of Education is carried on which we should not term Education, because it neither developes the Intellect nor influences the Moral Feelings.

Do you consider then that the Inefficiency for the Purpose of training the Mind to active Exertion, which you have described to be the prevailing Feature in the particular Schools to which you have alluded in the Dominions of the Ecclesiastical States, applies equally to all the Schools which are conducted by Roman Catholic Schoolmasters in other Parts of the Continent?

That will depend entirely upon the Degree of Influence which the Roman Catholic Clergy have over the Roman Catholic Schoolmasters and over the Schools. Wherever the Roman Catholic Clergy have Influence they will use it in that Direction. They may not possess much Influence; and in France at this Moment the Influence of the Roman Catholic Clergy over a great Number of the Schools, where nominally there are Roman Catholic Schoolmasters, is exceedingly neutralized by other Causes. But wherever the Roman Catholic Clergy can they will draw Education into their Hands; they will put that Education into the Hands of Nuns and Friars and Monks if they can; and if they cannot, into the Hands of Masters who are as near the Principles and Devotion of Nuns and Friars and Monks as possible.

But in point of fact, from your extensive Acquaintance with the Subject of Education generally, are you of opinion that all Schools which are patronized or conducted by Roman Catholics are so entirely under the Dominion of the Priest as to exclude the Benefits of Education?

It would be perhaps too strong to say that it entirely excludes the Benefits of Education; it very much weakens the Benefits of Education. I am not sure that I should say that it entirely excludes the Benefits. It makes the Schools much worse than they otherwise would be if they were without the Influence of the Roman Catholic Priests.

Have you any Acquaintance with the Roman Catholic Schools in Germany?

I have no personal Acquaintance with them.

Assuming for a Moment that the Roman Catholic Priesthood of Ireland would have the same Object which you impute to the Roman Catholic Priesthood of the Continent, that of drawing into Places which they call Schools Assemblages of Children for the Purpose of inculcating the peculiar and objectionable Doctrines of the Roman Catholic Religion, do not you conceive that giving the Children a general Education for Five Days in the Week would rather tend to counteract that evil Disposition of the Priests than to assist it?

I confess I should look very much for the Success of the general System of Education to the Person who managed the School; to the Master, and the Person to whom the Master looked as his Patron, — as his real and effective Patron; not to the Board, but to the local Patron. I should take it that in all Cases the Master is the School. The School does not consist in the Rules which a general Board please to lay down, for it is quite obvious that those general Rules may be kept for a Day or a few Days, when the Inspector of the Board is to make his Tour, but that they may be laid aside To-morrow, and never used at all; and in some Cases, which I think I quoted to your Lordships before, I gave Instances in which the Rules of the Board were most flagrantly violated by the Masters. Therefore the Question is, who will the Master be? who will choose him? and what will be the Master's Interest? If the Roman Catholic Priest chooses the Master, or if his Recommendation

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

to the Board is the effective Choice of the Master, then the Master will be the Tool in the Hands of the Roman Catholic Priest, and whatever be the Roman Catholic Priest's Object the Master will be the Man to work out that Object in the daily Exercise of the Children. Therefore, if any one asked the Question, what is the practical Point in a School? I should say, "Give me the Master." Regulate the School as you will by any System of Rules or any System of Books, I will venture to say, that however excellent the Regulations may be they will be perfectly ineffective if there is a bad Master; and however imperfect the Regulations may be, if there is a good Master he will work them well. In illustration of this I will venture to cite a Case which I know well in the City of Glasgow. About Twenty Years ago several of the Clergy of Glasgow were anxious to form an united System of Education which should embrace the Roman Catholic Children, and they came to an Agreement with the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Day, who was a Person apparently of very moderate Principles, and very ready to unite with them. I rather think Dr. Chalmers was at the Time in Glasgow; and when I mention his Name that will be sufficient to show that nothing was desired but what was for the Benefit of the Scriptural Instruction of the Children. The Roman Catholic Bishop said, "I will agree to have, not merely Extracts from the Bible, but the whole Bible read in the Schools; aye, and read every Day, and you shall have the Power of visiting the School and inspecting the School every Day, and at all Hours in the Day. There is only One small Point which in return for this free Permission I require, and which I am sure you will grant; and that is, give me the Appointment of the Master." The School has now been in existence about Twenty Years, and Two Years ago I requested several Persons of Glasgow to institute an Investigation, and among them several of the Clergy in their own Parishes, to discover whether any one of the Children educated at that School had either in any remarkable Way distinguished himself intellectually, or had become either a Protestant or a Person more moderate in his Roman Catholic Views, and they told me that they could find none. There were at that Time a very large Body of warm Protestant Supporters of the School, but the Fact which was brought in this Way under their Notice shook the Confidence of many in the School, and a great Number have withdrawn from its Support. It was clear that the Roman Catholic Bishop having gained the Master had gained every thing, because, although the Bible was read, it is obvious that a Nod or a Wink of the Master's Eye might destroy the Effect of the finest Passages. It was merely by a Shrug of the Shoulders, without uttering a Word, to convey to the Children that this was all Nonsense, or to say to them on the Sunday, "What you read on the Week Day is a hateful heretical Book, printed by Protestants, which we are obliged to read in order to get the Money of our Protestant Neighbours, but it is a Book you are to disbelieve." This he might do without any Person being able to discover it. If I went to the School I should find the Master apparently discharging his Duty, and reading this which the Children considered a heretical Book, and which they hurried over with the Contempt they were taught to feel for it. Therefore it is clear that if the System had been reversed, if the Protestants had taken the opposite Course, and had said to the Roman Catholic Bishop, "You may make the Regulations for the School, and select Extracts from the Scriptures, but we will appoint the Master;" by putting a scriptural and pious Man into that School it is obvious that he would have infused his Spirit into the Children, even with the most imperfect Extracts from the Bible; whereas by having a Roman Catholic Master the whole Effect of the System is completely defeated; and that therefore brings me to the Point on which I took the Liberty of mentioning these different Examples. When once I have established the Fact that the Object of the Roman Catholic Priesthood is to draw together Assemblages of Children in what are in fact training Schools for Bigotry, if you appoint a large Number of Masters who are selected by the Priests, you are sending forth an Army of Men who are training the Children to those Doctrines of Bigotry; and so far from developing the Intellect or improving the Morals of the Peasantry, you are just strengthening the Hold of Superstition upon the rising Generation. As a Proof that, in stating the Object of the Clergy of the Church of Rome as developed on the Continent, I am not stating them incorrectly as regards the System in this Country, I would mention a Case brought before me in Manchester by the Chaplain of the

Gaol

Gaol there. It is usual now in Manchester to see every Easter a Parade of a great Number of Children, many Hundreds, who are educated in the Roman Catholic Schools of Manchester, who are paraded, very well dressed, through the Streets in order to show to the Protestants of Manchester the Interest which the Priests of the Church of Rome take in the Education of the Children; but it struck the Chaplain of the Gaol as a very remarkable Fact that there were a great Number of Children sent into the Gaol from this very School, which did not speak much for their Morals; we found also that very few of those Children could read, which did not speak much for their Education. This struck him as very remarkable, and he inquired more particularly into the Nature of the Education given in the School, and he found that it was such as I have described; an Education of Dogmas,—of Catechisms, an Education in the Doctrines of the Church of Rome; an Education in which the Child committed somewhat to Memory, but as that passed from his Memory he forgot all that he had learned; and as his Reading was imperfect, he became in the course of a short Time after leaving School unable to read; so that, having learned imperfectly to read in the School, he perfectly forgot it in the course of a Year or Two. This is a School, not in Italy or Spain, but in the Heart of England; a School under the Charge of the Clergy of the Church of Rome.

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Admitting for the Moment the evil Intentions of the Roman Catholic Priesthood with reference to the Schools in which their peculiar Doctrines are to be taught, will not a System which enforces some Degree of general Instruction upon the Children committed to their Care rather tend to counteract, than not, such evil Intention?

The only Way in which you can enforce the System is by good Masters, and if you commit the Choice of the Masters practically to the Church of Rome, so far from enforcing that, you establish a System the very reverse.

Supposing that general Instruction during Five Days in the Week could be enforced honestly and fairly according to the proposed System, would or would not that have a beneficial Effect in counteracting the Evil which you have described?

If it was a System simply literary I then doubt whether it would have that Effect for this Reason: that when we consider that the Children of the Poor, whatever Instruction they are to receive, are to receive it within the Walls of the School, if the System to be taught is purely literary, excluding Religion, it is in fact teaching them to disregard Religion; and the Effect will be, as is the Case in many Parts of France, you will have on the one Side, where the System is not enforced, and where it is left to the Priest, Bigotry taught; and where the System is enforced, and taken out of the Hands of the Priest, you will have Infidelity taught. You will have the Child taught to consider Religion of no Consequence, because the Colouring of his Mind will take place within the Walls of the School, and there will be no Colour of Religion in it; it will not take place upon the Seventh Day, but during the Six Days; the Habits and Feelings he is taught to receive in the School will be those which will govern him during Life.

Does your Observation apply to a System literary in its general Object, but with the Addition of those Scripture Lessons to which your Attention has so repeatedly been called?

I have already said that the Scripture Lessons in the Hands of an unfaithful Master will be worse than useless, and that so far from adding Religion they may probably add a direct Disrespect for the Bible to an Indifference to the Subject.

Your Objection then arises upon the Assumption of Unfaithfulness in the Master, either in not teaching the Scripture Lessons at all or teaching them accompanied by Comments calculated to defeat their Effect?

Yes; Unfaithfulness on the Part of the Master to the general Recommendations of the Board.

Should you consider that a Child who has been taught Obedience to the Will of God, Belief in Salvation through Christ, and the Duty of loving his Neighbour as himself, would be more or less apt to receive further Instruction

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

in Religious and Moral Truths than a Child who had had either no such Instruction at all or had received it imperfectly?

I can certainly say that he would be more likely to receive further Instruction; but I must guard myself by saying that I conceive he would not receive that Instruction in those Schools.

But if that Instruction was properly administered contrary to your Assumption, that it is not properly administered by the Masters, then would you conceive that he was better fitted for further Religious and Moral Education?

I would; always guarding myself by saying that it is impossible, according to the Argument I have just held, that it should be given, for a Variety of Reasons which I have stated.

In the Schools you have visited have you ever discovered any immoral Books actually in use, or had Reason to believe that they were in use?

I never discovered any immoral Books in use; I discovered frequently Departures from the Rules of the Board.

You have stated that you believe that immoral Books had been continually in use in Roman Catholic Hedge Schools; do you conceive that there is no Advantage in a Catholic Child being instructed in a School from which such immoral Books are excluded, as compared with Instruction in Schools in which they are habitually used?

I must take along with that the Consideration that he is instructed by a Master who teaches him habitually on the Seventh Day Books which I should hold, as a Protestant, decidedly immoral as well as unscriptural, because the Doctrine of exclusive Salvation is in my Mind a very immoral Doctrine, leading to Hatred and productive of Strife.

Do you conceive that that is a Disadvantage from which the Child attending the Hedge School is exempted, from his being less under the Dominion of the Roman Catholic Priest than the Child attending the National School?

I do not; but then I have to bear this in mind, that the Parents of the Children were thoroughly aware, and had become so for Years, that the Instruction that the Children were receiving in the Hedge Schools was a wretched Instruction, and they were eagerly seeking for another and a better Instruction. When, therefore, that was offered to them in the Scriptural Schools, they would in the End have prevailed over all the Denunciations of the Priests, and have sent their Children to those Schools; I entertain no Doubt of that.

Excluding that Calculation upon your Part as a Matter of Fact, is a Child attending a Hedge School less under the Dominion of the Priest on the Sundays than a Child attending the National School?

I think I stated that he was not.

You have been asked whether Children who have been taught that they are to obey the Will of God, that they are to be saved by Christ, and to fulfil their Duty to their Neighbour, in Schools, are more or less likely to receive further Instruction in Religious and Moral Truths than the Children who have had either no such Instruction at all or have received it imperfectly; will you state whether you are aware that there is any Rule of the Board which requires those Instructions to be given in those Schools?

I think there is a Rule of the Board which I have stated before is a Recommendation to use the Scripture Extracts.

Is there any Rule that requires the Instruction which is implied in that Question?

No; and in point of fact it appears from One or Two Cases which I mentioned before that the Scripture Extracts are very often laid aside and not used.

But where the Scripture Extracts are used are not those fundamental Principles of Religion and Morality contained in those Scripture Extracts?

They are formally contained in them; but I presume that the Object of the Nation is not to give a formal List of Books to Children, but to make an Impression upon their Minds; and then there enters another Element altogether, which is not noticed in the Question, and that is, whether the Master will honestly

honestly and efficiently convey out of those formal Books the Instruction contained in them into the Minds of the Children. *J. Colquhoun, Esq.*

Then your Objection is not to the Selections made in the Books not containing those fundamental Doctrines, but it is founded upon the Belief that though they are contained in those Books, the Books are not used by the Master for that Purpose?

My Objection is to the Mode in which they are used by the Masters.

You are acquainted with the Scripture Extracts?

I have looked through them.

The Committee have understood you to say that the Peasantry of Ireland are, in your Opinion, very desirous of reading the Scriptures?

I think intensely desirous.

Is not that a Desire which as a good Protestant you would earnestly wish to gratify?

Certainly.

Would you not wish to gratify it even supposing there was no Man to explain the Scriptures to them?

I would certainly be very glad to see it gratified by a Society distributing the Bible, which would meet the Wish of the Peasantry of Ireland; I should be glad to see Bibles distributed in Ireland.

You would be glad to see the Scriptures in the Hands of the Roman Catholic Peasantry of Ireland, even though they should not have any one to explain them properly to them?

Certainly I should be most anxious to see that.

Should you conceive that it would lead to a future Desire to read the Scriptures on the Part of the Roman Catholic Children of Ireland, if they were honestly taught unobjectionable Scripture Extracts in Schools of common Education even without Explanation?

Most undoubtedly; if the Children are honestly taught Scripture Extracts, however small those Extracts were, by a Master honestly feeling a Reverence for the Scriptures, I should rejoice. But then in order that such a System may be carried into effect we must have an honest Wish on the Part of the Master, instead of which I feel persuaded there exists a real Desire on the Part of a great Number of the actual Masters to throw Doubt and Darkness upon the Authority of the Scripture, and to dash all Respect for it from the Children's Minds. I hold that to be the Case for the Reasons I have already given, that the Master is chosen by the Priest, and that the Priest has certain Views which I have detailed.

Supposing, for instance, that the whole Gospel according to Saint Luke were read, even though not a Word of it was explained by the Master, but fairly read by the Scholar, do not you think that the Child would understand much that was most essential to lead him to the Performance of his Duty to God and to Man, and to the proper Principle, namely, the Fear of God, on which his Duty was to be performed?

I certainly do. If a Master could be planted in every Parish of Ireland honestly impressed with the Principles of the Gospel of Saint Luke, and conveying those Principles to the Minds of the Children, I should feel that an amazing Object was attained for the Good of Ireland.

With the Opinion which you have expressed, do you think that any System of united Education could be adopted which was not founded on Protestant Principles?

I confess I should say that the only united System of Education in which a Protestant feeling as I do could coincide would be one which was founded upon the Principle of conveying Scriptural Truth to the Minds of the Children. I may mention, as an Illustration of my View of the Case, Scotland. There was in Scotland precisely the same State of Things soon after the Reformation as now exists in Ireland. There was a Roman Catholic Peasantry to a great Extent very imperfectly educated, very vicious, and the Country abounding in Crimes. The Church of Scotland proceeded not upon the Principle which the

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Board of Education has proceeded upon, but upon the Principle of offering a thoroughly good Education, embracing Scripture, to all the Parishes in all Parts of Scotland. It was quite clear that in carrying into effect such a System she must have expected to be confronted by the Opposition of all the Priests of the Church of Rome; she was met by that Opposition in every Part of Scotland; but she counted upon this also, that the Thirst of the People for Knowledge would overbear their Feelings of Deference to the Priests; and that whilst on the one hand there was a strong Desire on the Part of the People to reach this Education, and on the other the Church said, "You cannot have this Education without the Scriptures," and the Priest said, "You shall not read the Scriptures," the Effect would be that the Priest's Authority would be trampled under Foot, that Superstition would fall, and that Protestantism would therefore be established; and such is the Fact of History. The Fact I take from the Testimony of the Roman Catholics themselves. About the Year 1560 the Bible was scarcely known in Scotland, except among a very limited Class; in 1579, only Nineteen Years after, in the Preface to the First Edition of the Bible, it is there stated that the Bible was in the Hands of almost all the Peasantry of the Lowlands; so that Nineteen Years of efficient Action on the Part of the Church of Scotland, in despite of all the Influence of the Priesthood, availed to carry it into the Lowlands. Then there remained the Highlands, which were still locked up, and which were to a great Degree Roman Catholics. They proceeded, however, in the Highlands on the same Principle as they had proceeded in the Lowlands. They did not say to the Priests of the Church of Rome, "Will you agree with us upon a System of Education in which we shall strike out the Teeth of all our Principles, and adopt a marrowless System from you;" but they took their own Principles, and established their Schools upon those Principles; they planted their Schools in every Parish which their Funds enabled them to reach. And what was the Effect? Why, that just as the Scriptural Schools advanced Knowledge and Civilization advanced, and Vice and Crime receded; and about the Year 1640, so low had the Roman Catholic Religion fallen in Scotland, that the Roman Catholic Almanack published in Edinburgh in 1833 contrasts the present Period with the Period of 1640, at which Time they said the true Church was almost extinct in Scotland; that Extinction being owing, or at all events being subsequent, to the Exertions of the Church in establishing Scriptural Churches and Scriptural Schools in all Parts both of the Highlands and Lowlands.

Then in fact you would expect Good to result from such a System in proportion as the Authority of the Priesthood would be resisted by the People?

I believe entirely with Mr. Burnett, that the Power of the Roman Catholic Priesthood in all Countries is utterly inconsistent with popular Knowledge and popular Morals; and therefore if the Mode by which that Influence can be got rid of is by a Struggle on Education, which enlists the Feelings of the Parents strongly, and induces them to oppose their Priests strongly, it is clear that the Power of the Priest will be got rid of quickly, and the quicker for the Civilization of the Country, in my Judgment, the better. It will be got rid of the most quickly by the Parent finding that in order to put his Child to a good School he must confront and defy the Authority of the Priest; and I think I could refer to an Opinion of one of the former Commissioners of Education Inquiry in Ireland, Mr. Glassford, who in Conversation stated to me that he found in many Parts this Struggle was going on, and that the Results of it were apparent in Ireland. On the one hand, the Parent had nothing but a Hedge School to send his Child to, which he knew to be a very bad School; on the other hand he had the Scriptural Schools offered to him, which the Priest denounced, but which he knew to be good, and he felt drawn by the Feelings of a Parent to overcome his Reverence for the Priest. I have no Doubt the Result would have been in Ireland as it was in Scotland, that Scriptural Schools would have been planted every where, that the Parents would have forced a Way for their Children into those Schools in despite of the Priest, and the Priest's Authority would have been trampled under Foot in the Struggle.

Should

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

Should you then consider it objectionable even to give separate Education to Roman Catholics, unless it was given on Principles which required Resistance to their Priesthood?

I should decidedly. I conceive that a Protestant State will find itself to be at issue with the Principles of the Priests of the Church of Rome; and they occupy the most favourable Position if that Issue be taken on the Ground of Education, in which the Feelings of the Parents will be enlisted on the Side of the Protestant State. I think it much better, therefore, that the Protestant State should meet the Collision of the Priesthood upon the Ground of Education than upon any other Ground; nor do I conceive that you can avoid this Collision. If you intend to give a solid Education to the People I do not think it possible to avoid it.

Then is it to be inferred that you would leave the Roman Catholic Population entirely in Ignorance unless so far as you can enforce Protestant Education upon them?

I would certainly not leave them in Ignorance any more than the Church and State of Scotland left the People of Scotland in Ignorance. I would place in every Parish a Scriptural School; I would make that School admirable in its intellectual Arrangements; I would take care that the Master should be an efficient Master, and I would then trust most confidently to the Desire of the Peasantry for the Education of their Children to overleap the poor and feeble Barriers which the Priests would interpose. I have no Doubt that they would enter that School in despite of the combined Opposition of all the Priesthood of the Church of Rome.

Then you would openly avow that you would act upon the Principle of Proselytism in the Education that you would give?

I do not see that that follows as a Consequence. I am not aware that the Church of Scotland did avow that she acted upon the Principle of Proselytism. There is no Doubt that the Effect was a most proselytizing Effect, and so did the Roman Catholic Priesthood hold the Kildare Street System, and all Scriptural Systems, to be proselytizing.

You stated that this Roman Catholic Almanack contrasted the present State of the Roman Catholic Religion in Scotland with what it was in 1640; are Matters gone back with respect to Protestantism; has the Roman Catholic Religion taken a Spring of late in Scotland?

The Committee are probably aware that since the Cotton Manufacture has existed in Scotland we have had an annual Immigration of Thousands from Ireland, the greater Proportion of whom are Roman Catholics.

Then the Increase of the Roman Catholic Religion is to be attributed to the Immigration from Ireland?

There is also naturally consequent upon Immigration a certain Degree of Conversion by Intermarriage, and on the other hand that is abated by the Activity of the Protestant Clergy.

You are not impressed with the Opinion that among the native Scotch the Roman Catholic Religion is upon the Increase?

I should hardly like to offer an Opinion upon a Question which is very strongly contested; one Side maintaining that it is upon the Increase, and the other maintaining that it is not.

Education making great Progress in Scotland, how do you account for the Increase which appears to have taken place amongst the Catholics?

From Immigration from Ireland. But I should also say that during the last Century the Church has exceedingly relaxed in her Efforts, chiefly from Want of Funds, in planting Scriptural Schools and Churches throughout the Country. The Population of Scotland has doubled since the Union, whereas the Parish Schools of Scotland have remained almost stationary; only about 100 have been added, though the Population has increased above a Million; therefore it is clear that the educational Efforts of the Church have not been so efficient during the last Century as they were during the preceding Century, and therefore I should not be surprised to find that there has been an Increase among Roman Catholics, nor am I surprised to learn that there has been no Diminution among the Roman Catholics in the Highlands. I should confidently

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

fidently expect a Diminution among the Roman Catholics if the same Means were resorted to which were effective about 200 Years ago.

In a former Question put to you the Phrase was used to "enforce Protestant Education;" you do not mean to say that you would recommend the Enforcement of Protestant Education upon them?

I meant to say, and believe I said, that the State should plant a good School in each Parish, and trust to the known Excellence of the School to attract the Children.

Not requiring that they should necessarily learn Protestant Doctrines in the School?

Certainly not.

But requiring that they should study the Scriptures as a necessary Part of their Education?

Even upon that Point I should say that was a Matter upon which Discretion might be used. I am not prepared to say that the State would act wisely in insisting upon the Roman Catholics reading the Scriptures in the School; but I am prepared to say that they should plant a good Scriptural School, with a good efficient Master, in every Parish, and that he should be left to his own Discretion upon that Point.

By "a good and efficient Master" do you understand necessarily a Master not of the Roman Catholic Religion?

I think so; because I question if a Roman Catholic Master would be "good and efficient."

In point of fact is it not known that the Scotch System of Education does not require the Presence of the Roman Catholic Scholars at the reading of the Scriptures?

It does not require it.

Then you would give no Education whatever to the Roman Catholics but through the Medium of Protestant Schoolmasters?

Through the Medium of Schoolmasters selected by a Protestant Body; I am not prepared to say that they must all be Protestants, because I know many Roman Catholic Schoolmasters in Ireland who are in that State of Transition of Mind in which they are passing from Roman Catholic Doctrines to Protestant Doctrines; and so far from wishing to exclude that Class I should hail them, and place them in the Schools.

Then in fact you would only have Protestant Schoolmasters, or such Roman Catholic Schoolmasters as you believed to be in a Transition State?

I should almost say that I would leave a larger Discretion than that; I would say that the Schoolmasters must either be Protestants or in a Transition State, or Men of such known Candour of Mind as would induce a Board who were watchful over the Interests of Protestantism to select them. I am not prepared to say that the Board using its Discretion might not select honest and conscientious Roman Catholics.

But you would object to any Schoolmaster who attended to the Recommendation or Desire of the Priesthood in not allowing the Scriptures to be generally read in the School?

I should object to any Master who would look for his Interest and consider himself under the Direction of the Roman Catholic Priesthood.

You would consider that his being a Roman Catholic would not be a decided Objection in your Mind, if he were from any Considerations independent of the Influence of the Priesthood?

Certainly; that is exactly the View I entertain.

Is it not true that of late Years the Church of Scotland has exerted itself with much Vigour in planting Schools in remote Districts of the Country where they were wanting?

It is beginning to do so, and as far as its Funds go it will do so.

Did you say that your Objection to the Religious Instruction in general Use in the National School was, that the Priests taught the Children that there was no Salvation out of the Church of Rome?

Certainly; that Doctrine is taught in the Catechisms which are taught in many

many Cases by the Masters of the Schools upon the Sunday, and those Books are referred to and sanctioned by the Board of Education. *J. Colquhoun, Esq.*

Have you ever visited any of the Kildare Street Schools?
I do not think I have.

Are you aware whether in the Kildare Street Schools, previous to the Establishment of the National Schools, the Number of Scholars was, generally speaking, increasing or diminishing in the Roman Catholic Parts of the Country?
I believe that it diminished rapidly from the Exertions made by the Priests; but I still remain of opinion that those Exertions might have been met if the State had shown itself determined to maintain Scriptural Instruction. I think there was on the Part of the Priests an Expectation that their Efforts would prevail to induce the State to endow such a System of united Education as the present, and consequently, I think, they acted wisely for their Purposes in withdrawing as many Children as they could from the Schools of the Kildare Place Society.

Do you mean, in speaking of the Efforts which might have been made by the State, any Interference by the State?
Not further Interference than by continuing or increasing the Grant to a Board of Scripture Education, instead of the present Board.

Then you think, that although the Number attending the Scriptural Schools was diminishing, if the Grants had been increased the Number of Children attending would have increased?
I think so, if it had been made clear to the Minds of the Priests and People that the Parliament of this Country would not give way upon that great Principle.

Do you think it would have induced the Priests to diminish their Exertions?
It probably would not have induced them to diminish their Exertions; their Exertions would have been continued for a certain Time, but they would have worn themselves out, or rather the People would have prevailed over them. The Struggle was going on, and I conceive we interfered at a very critical Moment of the Struggle. When the Priests had succeeded in withdrawing a great Number of Children, we interfered and established another System of Education. Had we instead of establishing another System of Education persisted in the old Scriptural System, and made it more efficient, then the Children would have leaped over the Priest's Barriers; and though he withdrew them in the Beginning of the Month, they would have been at the End of the Month in the School again.

You think that the Success of the Priests in withdrawing Children from the Schools in that State of Things is no Proof that they would not have been unsuccessful afterwards, if that Assistance on the Part of the State to the Scriptural Schools had been continued?
No Proof whatever.

Are there any Suggestions that you would make which would in your Opinion make the present National System of Education such as would be satisfactory?
I should say that the great Object of Parliament should be to reverse the Principles; the Two great Principles on which the present Commissioners have acted in the System of National Education. These Two Principles are the Principles of Central Power and of Priestly Influence; and so long as these Principles are acted upon the Board of National Education must be prejudicial to the Progress of Education in Ireland. On the first Point the Committee will observe, in the Evidence given by Mr. Blake before the Committee of the House of Commons, and which the Board have published as an Exposition of their Views, that the Object of the Board is to absorb into their Hands the Management of Education throughout Ireland. They would grasp, as Mr. Blake tells us, if Parliament would enable them, all the Funds which have been committed to the Charge of other educational Societies; they would obtain from Parliament a Power to levy a Rate for the Purpose of building and maintaining their Schools; they would cover the Face of Ireland with their Schools;

J. Colquhoun, Esq.

they would obtain the Power of compelling Landlords to sell Lands for their Schools. Having thus scattered them over the Face of Ireland, they would plant in different Parts Normal Seminaries for training Schoolmasters. Then, as to the Powers which they wish vested in them for superintending and managing the Schools, the Powers which Mr. Blake tells us they contemplate are of the most enormous and absolute Description. They are to supply, and they alone, all the Books which are to be used in the Schools; they are to nominate, and they alone, all the Teachers who are to teach in the Schools; they are to have the Power of removing the Teacher at their Pleasure; they are to have the Power of removing the local Committees who inspect the Teachers; they, and they alone, are to choose the Inspectors who are to itinerate through the Schools; so absolute, in fact, is to be their Power that, as Mr. Blake tells us, their Army of 5000 Teachers is to be as perfectly at their Command as the Police is (I use his own Illustration) at the Orders of Government. And the Board, invested with such enormous Powers, is to be relieved from almost all Control; for the Act of Parliament which is to enlarge the Powers of the Board is also to contract its Responsibility. "Parliament," he says, "is not to tie it up by strict Rules and Regulations, but to leave it an almost unfettered Discretion to be used in nearly all Cases." All in fact that Parliament is to do is to fill the Treasury of the Board; to pour in Funds into their Hands either by an annual Vote or a permanent Rate, or by both; it is to feed and sustain this colossal Body, and to leave it to stretch out its Five thousand Arms over Ireland, and to watch with its Argus Eyes the Proceedings of the Troops of Education whom it employs. Now I confess that this Object which the Board have in view is an Object which, as it seems to me, the Parliament of this Country should be jealous of. It is establishing a Despotism in Education; a Despotism which, if vested in weak Hands, may strangle and paralyze sound Education throughout the Country; which, if deposited in mischievous Hands, may poison the Sources of Education, and taint it throughout Ireland; which, if vested, as it may be, in the Hands of Men of sceptical Principles, may discharge the Nation of all Colour of Christianity, and blacken it with a universal Infidelity. But this is not my only Objection. Not only is such a Board liable to be perverted to bad Purposes; it is necessarily inefficient for Purposes of good. Your Lordships will observe that the Board draws all Power over Education into its Hands; the Condition and Management of all the Schools is made to depend upon the Board; and yet this Board, which thus undertakes to manage the Schools scattered over the Surface of all Ireland, is composed of Half a Dozen or a Dozen Commissioners residing in the City of Dublin. How are they to ascertain the real State of the Schools in Ulster or Connaught? They have obviously no Ways but Two; they must either send their Inspectors, and must trust to the Reports of their Inspectors, or they must trust to the Report of the local Patrons of the School. In Practice the present Board trusts to one or other of these Modes. Now, if your Lordships will turn to the Directions given to the Inspectors (Page 129. of the Pamphlet I have referred to), you will perceive what the Board contemplates: the Inspectors are to examine whether the Scriptures, for instance, are read at proper Times in the School; whether they are not introduced at improper Times; whether Religious Instruction is not introduced on Days and Hours when it ought to be excluded; they are to see that no improper Books are used in the School. These are the Directions gravely given to their Inspectors by the Board. How is it possible that any One of these Directions can be complied with? If the Inspector lived close by the School, and was able on any Day or Hour to enter it,—could break in upon the School unexpectedly, and discover what the Children and the Master were engaged in, I grant that he might comply with these Directions, and exercise a practical Superintendence over the School. But how often does the Inspector visit the School? Why, once in Twelve Months. The Inspector visits a School in Donegal in March 1837; he turns his Back upon that School, and will never visit it again till February or March 1838. What may happen during the whole of these Twelve Months? Supposing that he finds the Rules complied with on the 5th of March 1837, what Guarantee has he, what possible Guarantee can he have, that on every other of the Three hundred Week Days of the Year the Rules may not be grossly violated? The Time of his coming into the School in the Parish of A. in Donegal is perfectly well known, because he travels to it

J. Colquhoun Esq.

through the adjoining Parishes; on that Day he may find a full Muster of Children, the Scripture Extracts in their Hands, and not a single immoral Book or a single bigotted Book within the Walls of the School; but the Day after, and all the other Days of the Year, the Scripture Extracts may be tossed aside, and covered with Dust, as in those Schools which Mr. Price referred to; or the Children may be drilled in the Roman Catholic Catechisms throughout the Day, as is the Case in many National Schools in Ireland; or the Bible may be used in defiance of the Rules of the Board, as is the Case in the School at Armagh, which I witnessed, or in other Presbyterian Schools of which I was informed; bigotted immoral Books may be read, bigotted immoral Doctrines may be taught during the whole Year, and the only Day on which there is any Guarantee that they are not read and taught is the Day on which the Inspector in the course of his annual Rounds reaches the School. Such a System of Inspection is obviously a Mockery; it can only deceive the Board, and it is most singular that the Board should hold it out as a Guarantee to the Country for the Efficiency of their Schools. The Truth is, to have a useful Inspection you must have as many Inspectors as there are Schools; and if you were to establish (which is impossible) such a Number of Inspectors, quis custodiet Custodes? What Guarantee have the Board that the Inspectors will do their Duty? There can be, in fact, no Inspection worth any thing except the Inspection of trustworthy Men residing in the Neighbourhood of each School; and where are these to be found? It has been said the Irish Landlords may discharge this Duty. In the first place there are many Schools on the Estates of one Landlord: he cannot reside at the same Time near them all; he will often reside near none of them. He will thus in many Cases be unable to attend; in many Cases he will be unwilling; in many Cases, where he is able and willing, he will be no competent Judge of the Management of a School. To have effectual Inspection you must have the Superintendence of Men who are educated, who are constantly resident, and who feel such Attendance to be a Duty; and I know none such but the Protestant Clergy, without whose Superintendence I do not think that the Schools can effectually proceed. This has been understood and acted upon for Three Centuries in Scotland, where our National System of Education has been under the Superintendence of the Clergy, and where it derives all its Energy from that Superintendence; and so aware are the Swiss Cantons of this, that, as Dr. Bowring states before the Committee of the House of Commons, the Clergy are Inspectors of the Schools in the Cantons. But the Protestant Clergy of Ireland, whether Episcopalian or Presbyterian, keep aloof from the Schools under their present System of Management. They do so with Reluctance I well know; but if the Clergy partake of the Objections to the Schools which I have stated, they are not only justified in abstaining, but they are called upon to avoid encouraging Schools which serve as training Schools to the peculiar Doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. This brings me therefore to the last Principle, which Parliament I hope will reverse in the Management of the National Schools, and that is, the Principle of allowing to the Priesthood of the Church of Rome the Influence which they now possess over the National Schools. That Influence, as I have already shown, is always used to promote a bigotted Attachment to the Church of Rome, and to degrade the Intellect and Morals of the Child. A Protestant Clergyman cannot, in my Judgment, be a Party to a System which has this Effect, and therefore he must abstain, and I think will always abstain, from the National Schools, so long as the Priesthood of the Church of Rome are allowed in any Degree to interfere with them, or to exercise any Influence, direct or indirect, over them.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjoured to Thursday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Jovis, 4° Maii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Rev. C.R.Elrington, D.D.

The Reverend CHARLES RICHARD ELRINGTON, D. D., is called in, and examined as follows:

You are generally resident in Dublin?
About Half the Year in Dublin.

You fill the Office of Regius Professor of Divinity there?
I do.

Have you turned your Attention much to the Education of the poorer Classes in Ireland?
For the last Twenty Years I have been actively engaged in it.

Have you been connected with any particular Board or Society?
I have been a Member of the Association for discountenancing Vice, and the Board of Erasmus Smith.

Have they many Schools under their Direction?
Yes.

Were you in the habit of personally visiting the Schools which were under their Direction?
Whenever I had an Opportunity.

Have you in point of fact visited them pretty frequently?
I have.

Were you able there to see how the Children of different Religious Persuasions attended?
Yes; and we have under both Societies Inspectors, and accurate Returns made.

In point of fact did the Children of Roman Catholic Parents attend much at those Schools?
They did.

You have said you are especially connected with the Association for discountenancing Vice; what is the Principle of the Association for discountenancing Vice in regulating the Instruction in its Schools?
Its Rules are, that the Master must be a Protestant, that the Scriptures must be read in the Authorized Version, and no Catechism can be taught in the School except the Church of England Catechism.

Are those Regulations in Practice strictly observed?
Strictly.

Is the Catechism of the Church of England used in most of those Schools daily?
I should say not.

The Scriptures constantly?
Yes.

You have said that the Roman Catholic Children were in the Practice of freely attending those Schools?
Freely.

When you say that they were in the habit of doing so, do you mean to say that that Practice continues?
I do, but not in the same Number that it did.

Rev. C.R.Elrington, D.D.

When was it that the Roman Catholic Children attended in the greatest Numbers at those Schools?

Previous to the issuing of the Commission for Education in the Year 1824.

Previous to 1824 there was the greatest Number of Roman Catholics?

The greatest Proportion previous to 1824; the Number of Protestants and Roman Catholics attending those Schools were nearly equal.

Since that Time have they greatly decreased?

I can give your Lordships the precise Numbers. In 1822 the Numbers were 5,479 Protestants, and 4,672 Roman Catholics. In 1828, which was the Year immediately before our Parliamentary Grant was withdrawn, there were 13,189 Protestants, and 5,494 Roman Catholics. And in last Year up to the last Return there were 10,014 Protestants, and 3,772 Roman Catholics.

Were those distributed pretty equally in the Schools, or did they in some Schools prevail more largely than in others?

Certainly it varies in different Parts of Ireland.

Can you state any special Instances at the present Day?

Yes, I have One from the County of Limerick—the School of Castleconnell.

In that School what Number of Roman Catholic Children are there now?

The Average Attendance is Twenty-two Protestants, and Fifty-seven Roman Catholics.

For how long is the Average taken?

The Average is taken every Month with us; but I have given the Average for Six Months.

There is a Castleconnell mentioned in Page 28 of the Return of Schools under the Board. Is that the Castleconnell you have alluded to?

It is.

How many Children do there appear to be in the National School there?

It states that there are 63 on the Roll.

Is there any other Parish of which you have got a special Return?

I have got a Return from a Parish in the County of Louth, in the Diocese of Armagh, the Parish of Faughart.

How many Children are there in the School there under the Association for discountenancing Vice?

The Average Number here appears to be, for Six Months, Two Protestants, and about Thirty Roman Catholics.

Do you find any School under the National Board at Faughart?

No, I do not see any.

Have you any other Returns of special Parishes under the Association?

No, I have not.

Those, of course, were sent to you as rather extraordinary?

They were to show that there was still Attendance at those Schools.

Of course you see that in the Total Numbers you have mentioned there is not more than One Third of the Number Roman Catholics, and those are, therefore, singular Instances?

They are.

Were the Schools under the Association for discountenancing Vice spread pretty generally over Ireland, or confined to any particular Parts?

They were all over Ireland.

You have given to the Committee a Return of the Number of Protestant and of Roman Catholic Children at the Castleconnell School in 1836; have you any Means of stating what were the Proportions of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in 1828 at that particular School?

No, I have no Particulars.

So that whether there has been in that particular School an Alteration or not you have not the Means of stating?

I have not.

Do you know how many Schools there were under the Society for discountenancing Vice? Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

When we had the Parliamentary Grant I think the greatest Number was 330.

How many are there now?

I can hardly say we have any. They are in a Sort of Connexion with the Association, but we have had no Funds to give them; and since the Return of Castleconnell of March 1836 we have called for no further Return, because the calling for a Return is a Sort of Pledge to pay the Schoolmasters, and we have no Funds to pay them. This of March 1836 is the last Return we have called for.

When were the Parliamentary Grants wholly discontinued?

In 1831.

When were they commenced?

In 1800. The Association was incorporated at the Union.

Those Grants varied in Amount?

They did; and at first the Association did not support Schools.

When did the Schools begin?

About the Year 1806.

When was the largest Amount of Parliamentary Grant?

I think it was in 1824 or 1825. I think it was for Two or Three Years the Sum of 10,000*l.*

According to the Numbers you have stated, there is a great Difference in the Proportions of the Protestants to the Roman Catholics in the Year 1822 and in the Year 1828; have you any particular Way of accounting for that Disproportion?

Yes; the Roman Catholic Children were removed as far as was possible from the Schools on the Appointment of the Commission of Education Inquiry in 1824.

Does not that appear inconsistent with the Numbers you have stated, because you say there were 4,672 Roman Catholics in 1822, and in 1828 there were 5,494, from which it would seem that they could not have been removed from the Schools?

The Fact that I am stating is on Record in the Evidence before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, who examined on this Point; it is on Record that the Roman Catholic Children were removed from the Schools about that Time in the Evidence before the Commission of which Mr. Frankland Lewis was the Chairman.

But the Numbers you have given are taken from authentic Returns?

They are.

Then it is also upon incontestable Evidence that in 1828 there still were 5,494 Roman Catholics at the Schools?

Yes; but the Number of Schools in 1822 and the Number of Schools in 1828 were totally different. In the one Year they were nearly double the other: 330, I think, was the greatest Number which there was in 1828, and in 1822 the Number of Schools was but 159.

Then, in point of fact, was it the Case that the Children were removed at first in great Numbers, and in several Instances returned afterwards?

It was.

Will that in any Degree explain the Circumstance of the Number in 1828 being so large as it was, namely, that though many were removed in 1824 yet a large Portion of those returned before 1828?

It may to a certain Degree, but the Proportion never was restored to what it had been before.

Have you Returns of any other School in those particular Years?

No, I have not.

Rev. C.R. Elrington. D.D,

You have said that the Scriptures were read in those Schools generally, but that the Church of England Catechism was not used. But did not the Protestants learn the Catechism?

It is generally the Practice; and it is, by a great many Clergymen, preferred to teach the Catechism in the Church; and therefore the Children, instead of being taught it in the Schoolhouse, were taught it in the Church.

You mean in Sunday Schools?

I mean at other Times.

In obedience to the Rubric?

In obedience to the Rubric.

Then those Protestant Children receive no other teaching of the Catechism but what they receive in the Church from the Clergyman?

No.

And they had the habit of attending in the Church for that Instruction?

Yes; but there were many Instances in which the Catechism was used in the Schoolhouse, because the Clergyman had a Right to do it, and we never inquired except to know that there was no Compulsion used.

Do you of your own Knowledge know, that in many Instances that Right was exercised?

In some Instances it was, but I do not know of many.

Do you know of many where it was not used?

Yes, I do. The Order about the Catechism is negative; it is not affirmative. It is only that no Catechism but that of the Church of England should be taught.

But in some of the Schools the Catechism was also taught?

Yes, certainly.

Is it not your general Impression that in the generality of the Schools, the Church of England Catechism was not taught, but the Scriptures were read?

Indeed I cannot definitely answer the Question, for it is a Question upon which no Returns were ever asked for.

The Question is, whether it is not your Impression of the general habit of the Schools, that they did read Portions of the Scriptures, but that they did not generally teach any Catechism?

It depended entirely upon the Situation of the School. If the School was in a Part of the Parish remote from the Church, the Clergyman made use of it for the Purpose of having the Children collected there; and if it was near the Church he generally, I think, preferred the Church.

Were the Clergy generally the Patrons or Superintendents of those Schools?

They must be; that is, they must sign the Certificate.

What was the Certificate; was it the Certificate for establishing the School?

No; it was sent in every Six Months; a Certificate of the Number of Children attending, and an Average made for each Month of the Six Months, stating also what Books were read in the School, the Number of Children reading and writing, the Number of Children in the Scripture Class, the State of Repair of the Schoolhouse, who visited the School, what Salary the Master had, and what Funds the School had. I will deliver in one of the Certificates.

The same is delivered in, and read as follows:

1834

Rev. C. R. Elrington D.D.

THE CERTIFICATE

FOR THE HALF YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30TH, 1835.

It is requested that the Blanks in the following Certificate may be filled, and the requisite Erasures made by the Clergyman who signs it.

I certify that I visited the Schools of (*a*) at least Times in every One of (*b*) Months included in the Half Year to which the accompanying "Report" relates; and that on at least (*c*) of these Visits in each of these Months I examined into the general Progress of the Children, and I have Reason to be satisfied with that Progress, so far as the Master (and) Mistress is (are) accountable for it. * And on the Day of 183 I held a special Examination in this School, of (*d*) Children of the Established Church, who were then in *daily Attendance* as Pupils of the School, in the Scriptures and Church Catechism, and found their Progress, on the whole, to be creditable to the Children, and to the Master (and) Mistress.

I certify that (*e*) Master (and) Mistress, is (are) a Member of the Established Church, regular in his (and) her Attendance on Divine Service, and a Person of good moral Character; he (and) she keeps a regular Account of the daily Attendance of the Children, and promotes Habits of Cleanliness and good Order among them.

(*f*) *Minister or Curate of the Parish of*

(*a*) The Name of the School is to be here inserted.

(*b*) This Blank to be filled with the Number of Months in which there was an immediate Superintendence of the School on the Part of the Clergyman signing the Certificate.

(*c*) Here the least Number of Inspections in any One of the Months of such Superintendance as above.

(*d*) This Blank is to be filled with the Number examined.

(*e*) The Name of the Master or Mistress to be here inserted: and if the School be under the joint Care of a Master or Mistress, the Names of both are to be inserted.

(*f*) Signature of the Clergyman now superintending the School.

It is perhaps superfluous to mention here, that the Examination of the Children of the Established Church belonging to the School, which is to be thus certified as held on a specified Day in each Half Year, is altogether distinct from the yearly Examination for Premiums on the System of the Association, and distinct also from the ordinary weekly Instruction given by the Clergyman.

The Committee of Schools hope, that the Expediency of keeping a Registry Book in each School will be evident from some of the Particulars which are to be certified half-yearly as above.

In Cases where the School is under the ordinary Superintendence of both the Incumbent and Curate of the Parish, or where the Duties of the Parish, together with the Superintendence of the School have been discharged by a Deputy during any Time included in these Returns, an accompanying Note may explain in what Manner the Visitation or Examination corresponding to the several Heads of the Certificate has been executed.

It is requested that the Clergyman who signs this Report will himself make the several Entries, under the Heads marked out for them.

The REPORT of the School of * in the Diocese of County of Post Town for the Half Year ending September 30th, 1835.

Number of Children *on the Roll* of the School, during each of the Six Months *severally*.			‖ *Average* Number attending the School during the same Months severally.	
	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.
April - - -				
May - - -				
Jun - -				
July - - - -				
August - - -				
September - -				

Distribution of the Children according to their Degree of Proficiency in the close of September 1835.	
Class.	No.
In Alphabet - - -	
— early Spelling - - -	
— early Reading - -	
— more advanced Ditto -	
Total in the School - -	
Of the above there are,	
In Writing - - -	
— Arithmetic - - -	
— Scripture Reading - -	
§ Catechism - - -	

Names of all Books used in the School, with the *Number* of Copies of each Sort, and the present Condition of them.	No. of Copies.

Names of Gentlemen and Ladies who act as Visitors of the School, or take an Interest in its Welfare.

QUERIES,
to which the corresponding Answers are to be written under them respectively.

1. Is there any Grant of Land in aid of this School? If so, of what Extent and Value? Is it secured by Deed or Lease, and is it at present enjoyed by the Master?
2. What is the State of Repair of the School-house, and the Size of the Schoolroom, or of the Schoolrooms severally?
3. Does the School receive pecuniary or other Aid from any Society or public Body, except this Association? If so, what is the Description of such Aid, and the Amount of it?
4. Are the Scriptures read in this School by all the Children who have learned to read, of whatsoever Religious Denomination?
5. Do the Children of the Established Church, who attend this School, avail themselves of the System of annual Catechetical Examinations for Premiums encouraged by the Association?
6. Are any Children excluded from the School on account of their being unable to pay?
7. Is the Roll kept with Regularity, with respect both to the total Number upon it and to the daily Attendance? And are the Names of such as have ceased to attend struck off the Roll monthly?
8. Has there been any Interruption in the Business of the School during the Six Months included in this Return? If any, for what Time?
9. Has there been any Change of Master during the Six Months included in this Return? If so, when did the present Master commence, and when did his Predecessor cease to teach the School?
10. Are there both Boys and Girls educated in the Institution? If so, state the Number of each Sex on the Roll, in the Close of September 1835.

‡ Amount of the Master's or (and) Mistress's Income, and whence derived, for the Year 1834.

From Children paying as below.			£	s.	d.
No.	d.	{ per Week, amounting for the Year to }			
	at	Do. - - -			
	at	Do. - - - -			
	at	Do. - - -			
Total from School Children - - - - -					
Amount from School Fund - - - - -					
SALARY FROM ASSOCIATION - - - - -					
As Parish or Vestry Clerk - - - - - - -					
From †					
Total Income of Master - - - - -					

‡ Receipts and Expenditure of the School Fund for the Year 1834, independent of the Salary and Gratuity of the Association.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.
From Subscribers as below - - -			
Donations as below -			
Charity Sermon as below			
From †			
Total Receipts -			

EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
Repairs - - -			
Books - - -			
School Requisites -			
Stationery - - -			
Fuel - - -			
To the Schoolmaster from this Fund, as stated above - -			
Total Expenditure -			

I have carefully investigated the Particulars of the above Report, and I certify that it is true and correct, this Day of 1835.

Minister or Curate of the Parish of

now superintending the School of *

* It is requested, that, in the first blank Space, that Name may be inserted by which the School is most generally known in the Neighbourhood, or by which the Clergyman filling the Report wishes it to be permanently denominated in our List.

‡ If these Accounts have been already given in any Return within the present Year, they need not be stated in the present.

† In these Lines is to be entered any Income or Receipt, within the past Year (if there were any such), not coming under any of the preceding Heads.

§ State the entire Number of Children who are instructed in the Church Catechism.

‖ To find the Average Attendance during each Month, the Schoolmaster should add together the Number of Children who were present on each Day during the Month, and then divide the Sum so obtained by the Number of Days on which the School was open in that Month; the Result is the Average.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Who was the Clergyman who was required to sign the Certificate?
The Clergyman of the Parish.

Would a Clergyman who was not the Parochial Minister, but happened to have a Residence in the Parish, be empowered to sign the Certificate?
No; the printed Words are "Minister or Curate of the Parish."

Were the comparative Numbers of Protestants and Roman Catholics returned?
Every Month they were made up, and every Six Months returned.

So that, in fact, it was easy for the Proprietors of those Schools to give the Returns of the Number of Catholics and Protestants?
I never heard of any Difficulty.

You stated that in 1824, when the Issue of the Commission of Education Inquiry took place, a Number of Roman Catholics were withdrawn from the Schools belonging to the Association, and that some of them returned afterwards. What was the Reason of their Return?
I should conceive the superior Education that they met with at those Schools. And it is further on Record in the Evidence before those Commissioners, that, though there was no Compromise whatever in the Association Schools, they were less objected to by the Roman Catholics than any other Schools in Ireland.

Did the Roman Catholic Priesthood make Opposition to those Schools so early as the Year 1822?
I think we heard very little of their Opposition.

Upon what Terms or under what Arrangements were the Children admitted to those Schools?
Generally free; I might say always.

You have stated that the public Grant was withdrawn from the Association. Was there any public Expression at any Time from the Protestant Body of Regret that the Association was unable to continue its Services in the Education of the Poor of Ireland?
There were several Remonstrances made to Government upon the Subject, but I do not know that there was any public Expression.

Has the Withdrawal of that Grant from the Association been a severe Injury to the Protestant Establishment?
I think very severe.

A severe Blow to the Cause of the Protestant Religion in Ireland?
I think so.

Were Remonstrances addressed to the Government by the Association?
There were, and by the Bishops, as Supporters of the Association.

You say the only Funds possessed by the Association now arise from Collections and Charity Sermons in the Protestant Churches of Ireland?
And some Subscribers.

Have the Subscriptions diminished or increased since the Grant was withdrawn?
They have diminished very considerably. The principal Subscribers to the Association, Four to One, were the Clergy, and the Distress of the Clergy in Ireland synchronised exactly with the Withdrawal of the Parliamentary Grant.

Do you recollect what was the Amount of the Funds of this Association before there was any Grant at all?
No, I do not; my Memory does not go back so far.

When was the First Parliamentary Grant?
The First Parliamentary Grant was in 1800, for purchasing Bibles, and then in 1806, or 1807, the Schools were added.

Do you know what was the highest Amount of voluntary Contributions at any One Time?
Yes; I think the highest was something under 2,000*l.*

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

In what Year was that?
That was about 1826 or 1827; about the Time when it received the largest Parliamentary Grant, which was 10,000*l.*

You say that last Year there were upwards of 10,000 Protestants and 37,000 Roman Catholics in those Schools?
Yes.

And those are supported by voluntary Contributions only?
By voluntary Contributions. I can state to your Lordships what was the last Thing done in the County of Wexford for the Purpose of it. The County was divided into Four Districts, and Two Clergymen each took a District and collected in the several Districts as much as would support those Schools for this present Year in that County. That is the Way in which the Schools are now supported.

Has that Plan been adopted anywhere else but in the County of Wexford?
I do not know; it was in despair of any other Relief that we commenced it in January last.

Are the Majority of the Schools in the County of Wexford?
Certainly not. I speak of the County of Wexford as my own County.

You reside Half the Year in the County of Wexford?
I do.

When did the Parliamentary Grant begin to be diminished?
It began to be diminished in the Year 1828.

Do you know the Extent of the Diminution?
I think the First Diminution was to 7,000*l.*

Do you remember what it was the next Year?
I do not.

Was there any Diminution from that Year till the Year 1831?
Yes, there was. And in the Year 1831 the Grant was 5,000*l.* for the Purpose of the Association winding up all their Accounts and paying all the Debts that they had then incurred. There was 5,000*l.* taken off the General Education Fund of Ireland, which was granted in that Year.

At the Time of that Diminution was not the Grant for the general Purposes of Education extended?
I think it was.

You have said that the Education given in those Schools was a very superior Education. What was the Education given in those Schools? At what Age were the Children admitted?
It depended very much upon the different Parts of Ireland. The Age in different Parts of Ireland would be quite different.

Have the Schools any Rule with respect to the Age?
None.

Why is it different in different Parts of Ireland?
From the Habits of the People.

Were the Children of both Sexes in those Schools?
In general they were.

They were admitted according to the Rules of the School?
According to the Rules of the School.

What was it that was taught?
Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic.

Does the Certificate you have delivered in show what was taught?
It does.

Were you at the Head of the Association?
I was the principal Manager. I was the Secretary of the Association.

It did not begin as a School Association?
No; it began as a Bible Association.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

For circulating the Bible?
Yes.

Do you approve of Education?
Indeed I have been doing all I could to support it as long as I have been able to do any thing in such a Matter.

Do you approve of Persons of the lower Orders of Society being taught to read and write?
Not if you do not join Religion with it.

If you join Religion with it you do, so that in the Abstract you do not object to their being taught to read and write?
I object to any Species of Instruction which is not founded upon Religion.

But if it be founded upon Religion?
I think it is the greatest Boon you can give them.

When you say "founded upon Religion" do you mean one particular Religion, or some System of Christianity?
I can uphold but one System.

You mean true Religion?
True Religion.

By "true Religion" do you mean the Christian Religion, or do you confine it to the Protestant Doctrines?
True Religion I confine to the Protestant Doctrines, certainly.

Then if Children are not taught the Protestant Doctrines, do you object to their being instructed in Reading and Writing?
No, certainly not.

You were understood to state that you object to all Instruction, even to Reading and Writing, unless accompanied with Instruction in "true Religion," and you have said that you confine "true Religion" to the Protestant Doctrines?
Certainly.

Then do you, or do you not, state that you object to any Instruction given to Persons who are not likewise at the same Time instructed in the Protestant Faith?
No, I do not, if they are taught the Bible, if they are taught the System that I have been just alluding to. I think it of the greatest Advantage if they read the Bible, and if its Authority is fully acknowledged.

Do you mean if they are allowed to read the mere Text of the Bible, and to draw their own Inferences with respect to all the Doctrines that may be deduced from it?
Under the peculiar Circumstances of Ireland I would say so.

Are you rightly understood to say, that you mean that you consider that the general Moral and Religious Precepts that are to be gathered from the Perusal of Holy Writ are sufficient without any doctrinal Education at all?
No, certainly not; but there is a Difference between what you permit and what you would consider as sufficient.

By the Term "sufficient" was meant a sufficient Amount of Religion to justify a Person in giving Education to the Amount of Reading and Writing, because you were understood to say, that you thought that it was not advantageous for the Poor to have Education unless connected with some Religion, and you were understood since to say, that the Perusal of the Scriptures was sufficient Religion to be connected with that Education?
I said, that under the Circumstances of Ireland I would support Education where the reading of the Scriptures alone was required.

You do not mean to say, that, per se, you think that the best Course of Education?
By no means, but it is one that I would accede to from Necessity.

Rev. C.R.Elrington, D.D.

Under those Circumstances do you approve of the System of the Kildare Place Society?
I do not.

Do not the Kildare Place Society give that particular Species of Education you have just alluded to?
They permit the Douay Version of the Scriptures to be read, and they allow the Schoolmaster to be a Roman Catholic.

And you confine your Approbation, even under the Circumstances of Ireland, to Schools in which the Version of the Scriptures authorized by the Church of England, and no other Version, is taught, and in which that teaching is conducted by a Church of England Schoolmaster?
If Protestants are to be admitted to the School, certainly.

Will you explain the Reason why you should object to the Douay Version being used in a School?
I should object in general to any Version different from our own, without inquiring into the Question whether it was faithfully translated or not, because I conceive that when you give the Scriptures to a Child you present him with the Word of God, and you should tell him that you are presenting him with an infallible Guide; and that any thing that shakes his Opinion in that Guide so far mars the Purposes for which you have given him the Book, and I cannot conceive any thing to do that more effectually than a Diversity of Translation of the Scriptures.

Would you conceive an incorrect Translation of the Bible an infallible Guide?
I give him the best I have.

And your Notion of the best would be taken from the Authority of the Church, which recognizes the Authorized Version as the Bible?
Certainly.

Do you think that it would, under the present Circumstances of Ireland, be practicable to unite the Children of the different Religious Denominations in any One Plan of Education such as you would fully approve of?
I do not. I think that the Answer of Baron Foster and Mr. Glassford, who seceded from the other Three Commissioners, conveys the best Information upon that Subject. They state in their Answer that no One System of Education can do for Ireland.

By One System, you mean no common System?
No common System. I think their Words are, that there must be no One inflexible Rule.

You stated another Principle that you thought essential; viz. that there should be a Protestant Schoolmaster in every School into which Protestant Children were admitted. For what Reason do you think that essential in Ireland?
I think it is essentially connected with the reading the Scriptures in the Authorized Version.

Have you any other Reason?
And because the Control of the Roman Catholic Schoolmasters is, I understand, to be given exclusively to the Roman Catholic Prelates, or at least that they claim it for themselves.

When you say you understand it to be given exclusively to them, by whom and in what Manner given?
They have claimed it, I think.

You do not mean to say that the present National System gives the exclusive Right to the Roman Catholic Clergy?
I have no Means of determining whether it does or not; but I refer to that Document.

You are not familiar with the Rules of the National Board?
What I said was, that it was claimed by the Roman Catholic Prelates.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Do you remember a great Body of Resolutions that were put forward by the Roman Catholic Prelates in Ireland to the Commission of Inquiry into Education which was appointed in 1824?
I think I do.

Is this the Letter: a Letter from the Most Reverend Dr. Murray to the Commissioners of Education Inquiry dated 23d January 1826?
Yes.

Do you understand that to be the same Dr. Murray who is now one of the Commissioners of the National Board?
Yes.

Have the goodness to look at those Resolutions, and to read the Part to which you allude?
"That, in order to secure sufficient Protection to the Religion of Roman Catholic Children under such a System of Education, we deem it necessary that the Master of each School in which the Majority of the Pupils profess the Roman Catholic Faith be a Roman Catholic; and that in Schools in which the Roman Catholic Children form only a Minority a permanent Roman Catholic Assistant be employed; and that such Master and Assistant be appointed upon the Recommendation or with the express Approval of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese in which they are to be employed; and further, that they or either of them be removed upon the Representation of such Bishop. The same Rule to be observed for the Appointment or Dismissal of Mistresses and Assistants in Female Schools."

That came under the Authority of Dr. Murray?
Yes; that was one of the Letters which broke up the Commission.

Was the Prayer Book used in the Schools of the Association?
No.

You stated just now, that in your Opinion nothing tended so much to shake the Confidence of Children in the Scriptures as a Diversity of Versions; do you think that any Effect of that Sort is produced by the Diversity of Versions of the Psalms?
I am sorry there is a Diversity in the Psalms, but I think from the peculiar Circumstances the Evil is diminished, and the Two Versions of the Reading Psalms and the Singing Psalms are considered different devotional Expressions, not erroneous Versions.

Do you mean to say, that, as there are Two, there being a Third diminishes the Evil?
No; but the peculiar Nature of that Part of the Bible.

But the Third is not in the Bible?
No; nor is the Second Version in the Bible.

But you object to the Two?
I have no Hesitation to say that I am sorry there are Two.

Which do you prefer of the Two?
I should prefer the Version in the Bible.

But you say your Objection is diminished by there being a Third Version for singing?
It produces less Effect upon the Child.

There are Two Versions of the Singing Psalms, there is the old Version and the new; does that tend to diminish or to increase the Objection?
I think it prevents the Child from ever inquiring as to whether there is any Dispute about the different Readings.

In all the different Versions of the Psalms the Sense is substantially the same, is it not?
Yes, generally speaking, it is.

Then if the Sense is substantially the same in the different Versions of the Scriptures should you feel any Objection to them?
I should; I object to a different Version, without any reference to whether it is faithful or unfaithful.

Rev. C.R. Elrington, D.D.

But if the new Version be a more faithful Translation than the old one, should you not prefer it?

I might prefer it individually; but if one was the Authorized Version and used, I should be sorry that a new one was circulated among Children.

Then you would prefer for general Circulation the Authorized Version, though less faithful, to one which is not the Authorized Version, but is more faithful?

The Authorized Version is circulated, and until that is removed by the Authority that circulates it I do not wish the Mind of a Child to be shaken by a new Version.

And therefore it being the Authorized Version, though it be less faithful, supposing it to be less faithful, you prefer it to one which is not authorized, though it be more faithful?

I would prefer its Use for Children.

You were understood to say, that you prefer it for the Use of Children as long as it is the generally Authorized Version; but you do not mean to say, that you would prefer its being the Authorized Version although not so faithful as a new Version?

No, certainly not.

You have said that you would rather that there was only One Version of the Psalms. In point of fact, do you conceive that there is any Confusion caused in the Minds of young People by the Existence of those Two Versions?

I never knew of it.

Do you, in point of fact, believe that the Children generally know any other than the old Version of the Psalms which they are in the habit of using every Sunday in their Prayer Book?

I think not.

And that it is rarely that they come to know that there is any Difference in fact between the old Version of the Psalms, which they find in their Prayer Book, and the new Version, which they find in the Bible?

With Children I think scarcely ever.

Then, according to your Opinion, they are accustomed to the worse Version, and not the better one?

I believe it not to be the most faithful Version of the Two, but I should perhaps think it was the most useful for them, more easily intelligible.

Is it, upon the whole, so faithful as that you would assert of it that it is a faithful Exhibition of God's Word?

I should say so.

With respect to the Metrical Versions of the Psalms, do you think that any Human Being regards those Versions in the same light as the Prose Versions which profess to be literal, the other being professed to be accommodated to Metre?

I should think not.

You do not think then that they can tend to confound the Mind of any Child?

I do not think any Child could be puzzled by finding a different Line in Verse from what he read in the Prose Translation.

In the Schools to which you have referred as patronized by the Association the Bible was read generally?

Yes.

What was the Rule there about reading it?

Some Portion of it was read every Day.

And any catechetical Instruction that was given was given by the Clergyman?

Yes; the Master was strictly ordered not to interfere with any controversial Point.

But, without interfering with any controversial Point, was he authorized to offer any Explanation or any Instruction arising out of the Bible?

There was no Objection to his doing it if he did not meddle with Controversy.

During

591

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

During all the Years that the Society was in existence there never was a single Complaint of a Breach of Faith in that respect, and it has been appealed to frequently.

During those Years during which a large Number of Roman Catholic Children were educated at the School, was there ever any Complaint upon that Subject?
There never was a single Complaint.

Was the Selection of the Chapters in the Bible left to the Schoolmaster?
That was settled between the Master and the Clergyman; I believe the Clergyman generally settled the Part that was to be read.

Were the Roman Catholic Clergymen at all admitted to the Schools?
Every one was admitted.

But they were not admitted to teach any Catechism, even to their own Flocks?
Certainly not in the Schoolhouse.

What they did on Sundays in their Chapels, or at other Times, you had nothing to do with?
Certainly not.

What Sort of Persons were the Schoolmasters; were they well-educated Men?
They were very tolerably educated; most of them had been trained at the Training School of the Kildare Street Association, or at the Training School which the Association established at one Time in Dublin, and which they were obliged to give up for the Want of Funds.

What Salary had they?
The highest Salary that the Association gave was 15*l.* a Year.

You said they were all Protestants?
All.

Did you find that the resident Gentlemen in the Neighbourhood of those Schools assisted with Subscriptions or in any other Way?
In some Parts of Ireland they did; in others they did not. The Salaries were derived from local Funds and from the Children; they were very various; and in consequence in each of the Returns the particular Sum was stated.

Some of the Children did pay something?
Some of the Children did pay.

Were they not generally considered Parochial Schools?
Some of them were; they were generally confounded together from the Clergyman being the Patron of both.

Did not the Clergy generally consider that in subscribing to those Schools and attending to them, they were performing the Contract which they entered into at their Institution to their Parishes?
They did.

In what Part of Ireland were the Association Schools best supported?
I think in the North; they were very well supported in general.

Did all the Clergy of Ireland subscribe to those Schools, as their Parish Schools?
No; there were but 300 Schools at most in Ireland.

With respect to Erasmus Smith's Schools, can you state generally what were the Arrangements made with regard to those Schools?
They were very nearly the same, except that there was a Rule that upon a particular Day the Catechism of the Church of England must be taught in the School.

Do Roman Catholic Children attend the Schools?
They do attend them.

Rev. C.R. Elrington, D.D.

Those Schools are still in existence?
Yes, they are as numerous as ever they were. The Numbers in the present Year are 6,294 Protestants and 3,186 Roman Catholics.

Are those endowed Schools?
They are, under the Will of Erasmus Smith. He left large Estates in Ireland to Trustees for charitable Purposes, and those Schools are established under his Will.

Are they wholly supported by Part of the Property left by Erasmus Smith?
Entirely.

Is there any Boon beyond Instruction given to the Children that go there?
None.

There is no special Temptation of Clothing or Food?
None whatever; they are mere Day Schools, but they are Day Schools of a superior Class, because the Salaries of the Schoolmasters are larger.

What is the Salary of the Schoolmaster?
20*l.* a Year, and a Gratuity of 10*l.* if he conducts himself well.

Do you apprehend that the chief Inducement to Roman Catholics to attend those Schools is the Excellence of the System of Education there given?
I should think so.

At any Period were the Roman Catholic Children withdrawn in numerous Instances from those Schools?
At the same Time, in 1824, it was universal in all the Schools.

Have you any Memorandum with you which will enable you to state the Degree of Diminution at that Time?
No, I have not.

Do you happen to know what was the greatest Number of Roman Catholic Children at any Time attending those Schools?
No, I am not aware.

How many of Erasmus Smith's Schools are there in Ireland?
I think 130.

Where are they principally situated?
The largest Number of them is in the County of Down, but they are in every Part of Ireland.

You said that the System of Instruction was the same as that in the Schools of the Association for discountenancing Vice, except that it was imperative on One Day in the Week that the Catechism of the Church of England should be used in the School?
Yes.

Was it imperative on all the Children who attended those Schools that they should learn the Catechism?
No. Merely upon those Children whose Parents wished it.

Were all the Children required to read the Scriptures?
They were all required to read the Scriptures.

Even the Protestant Children were not required to learn the Catechism?
No, they were not.

What has been the Effect produced upon the Children educated together in those Schools; has it produced Harmony or not?
I never heard of any Disputes in the Schools.

The Children learning all the same Things lived in Harmony together?
They did.

Were

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Were the Roman Catholic Priests prevented from entering the Two Descriptions of Schools you have been describing, if they pleased to enter for the Purpose of inspecting the Establishment?
Certainly never.

Were they in the habit of going there?
No.

Do you know any Reason why they abstain from going there?
No, I cannot say.

Did they in general discourage the Schools?
I rather think they did.

But you do not know that positively?
No, I do not.

Did they endeavour to prevent Children from going to those Schools?
They did so, certainly.

Does not the Proportion of the Numbers indicate that there must be a Discouragement of the Roman Catholics from some Quarter?
Certainly.

You were understood to say that at the Time after you stated the Discouragement began the largest Number of Roman Catholics that ever was found in those Schools appear to have attended?
Yes; but the Number of Schools then was much greater, and therefore the Proportion never was kept up. It is evident that 4,600 to 150 Schools was much more than 5,000 to 300 Schools.

You have stated the Number of Roman Catholics now in Erasmus Smith's Schools to be 3,186; can you state the Number at any former Period?
I have no Returns of that.

Founded upon that Statement of 6,294 Protestant Children, and 3,186 Roman Catholic Children, does it or does it not appear to you that there has been Discouragement from some Quarter of the Roman Catholic Children attending those Schools?
I do know of Roman Catholic Children being removed from the Schools on the Estates of Erasmus Smith; the Schoolhouse has been left without any Children in it through the Influence of the Roman Catholic Clergymen.

But, as far as the Numbers you have given show, it appears that altogether the greatest Number of Roman Catholic Children educated all over Ireland by those Two Establishments amounted to 8,680; namely, 5,494 in one, and 3,186 in the other?
Yes.

And the Protestants educated in those Schools were somewhat short of 20,000 at that Time?
So I should think.

Do you know what Amount of Funds Erasmus Smith's Schools have?
I believe the Property is about 7,000*l.* a Year.

And the utmost Grant that was ever made to the Society for the Suppression of Vice was 10,000*l.*?
Yes; but the Funds of Erasmus Smith are not all applicable to those Schools. The Funds applicable to the Schools are not above 3,000*l.*

Then in fact the greatest Sum that was given independently of Subscriptions for the Two Establishments was 13,000*l.* per Annum?
Yes.

But when it is considered that the great Majority of the Schools of Erasmus Smith is in the North of Ireland, are you of opinion that the Number of Roman Catholics to Protestants is in a very great Disproportion?
No; I think that Circumstance raises the Proportion very much, because, certainly, there is no County in Ireland in which there are so many Schools of Erasmus Smith as in the County of Down.

Rev. C.R.Elrington, D.D.

Have you had an Opportunity of witnessing the Manner in which the System of Education has proceeded under the Direction of the National Board?
Not within the Schools.

But you are acquainted with the Principles upon which the Board professes to proceed?
I am, and I have been making most anxious Inquiry as to the Progress of it since it commenced.

What is the Opinion that you have formed as the Result of those Inquiries?
I should say it has failed altogether as a System of combined Education.

What are the Grounds of that Opinion?
I know a Number of Protestant Clergymen that are attending to the Subject in different Parts of the Country; and I can appeal to the Evidence of Mr. Carlile before the House of Commons last Year, in which he states that the Schools are divided. In fact, one School is the Priest's School, another is the Clergyman's School, and another is the Presbyterian Minister's School.

That Division takes place chiefly in the North of Ireland?
He states it generally over Ireland.

Speaking of those Three Schools, which does he call the Priest's School?
The School that the Roman Catholic Clergyman has recommended or patronized.

In the Principles of this System do you see any thing that is at variance with the Principles of the Church of which you are a Minister?
I do.

Will you state what?
I conceive that its excluding Religion from the System of Education is so.

You understand that the National System excludes Religion from the System of Education?
I do, on their own Statement.

Are you aware that the System, on the contrary, professes to rest its Instruction on Religion?
In their printed Paper they say that the School is to be kept open for a certain Number of Hours on Four or Five Days a Week for Moral and Literary Education only.

Have you seen the Report of the Committee on Education in Ireland of the House of Commons in 1828, which was ordered to be re-printed in 1832?
Yes, I am sure I have.

Do you remember whether that which has just been referred to is there or not?
No, I do not distinctly recollect the Report.

But you conceive that whether it makes that Assertion or not it does in fact in its Rules exclude Religion from the Instruction?
I conceive so.

And on that Ground you object to it as a Minister of the Church of England?
I do.

You said that it excludes the Scriptures during School Hours; are you aware that it recommends the Use of Extracts from Scripture?
Yes.

Do you object to the Use of Extracts from Scripture in School absolutely?
Individually, I do not.

Under the peculiar Circumstances of Ireland should you think it contrary to Principle, and such as to demand your Reprobation, if the Rule were to reserve the Use of the whole Bible to the Time of separate religious Instruction, if such Extracts from the Scriptures as you might think well chosen in the Authorized Version

Rev. C.R. Elrington, D.D.

Version and in sufficient Amount were made a necessary Part of the united Instruction?

I should not.

Then do you object to the Use of the Extracts of Scripture set forth by the Board?

I do.

Have you examined those Extracts?

I have.

Accurately?

Yes, I should say accurately.

Sufficiently so as to pronounce a decided Opinion upon their Character?

Yes; I merely hesitated because I would not say that I have actually collated every Line.

Will you give the Reason why, though you do not object absolutely to the Use of Scripture Extracts in a School, you do object to the Use of the Scripture Extracts set forth by the Board?

I object generally to them on the Ground I stated before, that they are in a different Version from the Authorized Version; I object generally to them on that Ground; and I object more particularly to them, because I think the Notes are objectionable, and I conceive that there are many Passages in them which are incorrectly translated.

Can you mention any Passages in those Scripture Extracts which are incorrectly translated?

The most prominent Passage is the Institution of the Sacrament, in which I must use a stronger Word than "incorrect."

What Word would you apply to it?

I would say the Translation was false.

What Passage is that?

It is in the Gospel of St. Luke, it is in the 121st and 122d Pages.

Will you have the goodness to state what you think to be the false Translation which occurs there?

The Verse states:—"Likewise also the Cup after they had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is about to be shed for you." I conceive that "about to be shed" is a false Translation.

What do you conceive ought to be the Translation?

"Which is shed for you."

What is the Translation in the Authorized Version?

"Which is shed for you."

Do you know the Translation in the Douay Version?

"Which shall be shed."

Do you conceive that "which is about to be shed" is a false Translation?

I do.

Do you recollect the original Word?

Εκχυνομενον.

The Participle in the Present Tense?

Yes.

When you say that is a false Translation, do you ascribe any Motive to the giving of this Translation?

I do not like ascribing Motives, but a false Doctrine has been founded upon this Passage.

Is this a Verse which has long been Matter of controversial Discussion between the Churches of Rome and England?

Yes, from the Reign of Elizabeth, from the Publication of the Rheims Testament in 1584, it was a Subject of Controversy.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

From that Time down to the present this Passage has been one of the Texts which have been most cited in Controversy; on what Point?
On the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

What was the Distinction of the Argument founded upon the Two Versions of this Verse?
The Roman Catholics think to establish by the First of the Two Verses the real Presence, and by the Second Verse the Difference between the unbloody and bloody Sacrifice: "This is my Body which is given for you: this do in Remembrance of Me. Likewise also the Cup after they had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is about to be shed for you." That referring to the bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, distinguished from the unbloody Sacrifice.

And that Version you consider to be favourable to the Roman Catholic Doctrine?
Certainly.

Is another Argument ever used in Controversy upon this Text, that it is favourable to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, inasmuch as "shall be shed for you" would not necessarily imply a figurative Meaning?
Yes.

The Expression "which is shed for you," which you say is the Translation in the Authorized Version, and the true Translation, do you consider that that necessarily implies a figurative Interpretation?
That would necessarily imply a figurative Interpretation.

And that therefore an Argument arises against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, inasmuch as it shows that one Part of this Passage must receive a figurative Interpretation, and therefore it increases the Probability that the other Passage had a figurative Meaning also?
Yes. And in the Roman Catholic Version the same Participle of the same Tense is translated in Two Verses in different Tenses.

In one Instance in the Present, and in the other Instance in the Future?
Yes.

And in both those Instances so as to accommodate the Notion of a literal Meaning?
Yes.

How do the Roman Catholics justify the Translation of the Present into the Future Tense?
I cannot tell how they justify it.

Do they deny that the Greek is authentic?
They refer to the Vulgate.

Is not the Vulgate a Translation of the Greek?
It ought to be a Translation of the Greek.

Do not they consider it as such?
They declare the Vulgate to be the authentic Copy to which all References are to be made. According to the Council of Trent all Controversies are to be decided by the Vulgate, without reference to the Greek, which of course the learned Roman Catholics must know to be the Original; but they say the Vulgate is the authentic Manual to which they are to refer.

Then in fact they consider that Translation, even though an erroneous Translation, as the Translation which is to guide them?
They do.

And this Version in the Scripture Lessons is accommodated to that false Version of the Roman Catholics?
Yes, it is.

Does any Reason present itself to your Mind why the Person who compiled this Volume of Extracts should have adopted a Phrase which is not the same

Rev. C.R. Elrington, D.D.

with either the one or the other, though it has a Meaning the same as the Roman Catholic?

I cannot conceive any Reason for it except to conceal the actual Agreement with the Douay.

Do you conceive the Translator of those Extracts could have done that which he professes to do, namely, take his Translation from the Greek?

No; any School Boy would know the Difference between the Two.

Are there any Notes in the Scripture Extracts which you object to?

I object to One great Class of the Notes, which are of a critical Character, and seem to me totally unsuited to the Education of Children.

Are you referring to those Notes which especially remark upon the various Readings, and the different Manuscripts, and the Names of Manuscripts, and the Names of Commentators?

Yes; I object to that whole Class of Notes.

Do you conceive those Notes to be worse than useless?

They are worse than useless, I think, because they increase the Evil which I have been deprecating, namely, that of giving to the Children various Versions. But I have stronger Objections to some of the Notes; I would object to some of the Notes as conveying false Doctrine.

What Notes do you conceive to convey false Doctrine?

In the Gospel of St. Luke there is a very remarkable Note, which asserts that the Spirits in Heaven know when Men repent.

Will you have the goodness to refer to it?

In the 15th Chapter of St. Luke, in the 85th Page: "By this it is plain that the Spirits of Heaven are interested in our Welfare; they rejoice at our Repentance, and therefore they know when we repent."

In what respect do you consider this Note to contain false Doctrine?

I consider that is the Attribute of the Deity; it is told us by Scripture that the Lord Himself only knows the Hearts of the Sons of Men.

Which do you mean is the Attribute of the Deity?

His knowing when we repent.

Do you know any Roman Catholic Doctrine that seems to be specially favoured by this Note?

I do; the Doctrine which our Articles well describe as "a fond Thing vainly invented and grounded upon no Warranty of Scripture," the worshipping of Saints and Angels.

Is there any thing in the Note that specially looks to Saints?

I think the Change from Angels to Spirits of Heaven does so.

Are you aware what the Note is in the Douay Testament?

I am not quite sure, but I think I recollect they join both Angels and Spirits.

Have the goodness to look at the Copy of the Rhenish Version now shown to you?

This is not the Note of the ancient Rhenish Testament; this is the corrected Note in the Dublin Editions.

Is that the Edition which was put forth in 1828 by the Roman Catholic Prelates, under the Sanction of the Commission of 1824?

I believe so; it is signed by them. The Note is, "By this it is plain that the Spirits in Heaven have a Concern for us below, and a Joy at our Repentance, and consequently a Knowledge of it."

Do you conceive that the Note in the Scripture Extracts of the Board is in Substance taken from the Note in that Testament?

I think it is; but I was alluding to the old Note.

Do you think the Passage itself rightly understood excludes any Reference to the Knowledge by the Angels of what is in the Heart of Man?

The whole Application of the Parable would be false if it was: "There is Joy

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

in the Presence of the Angels of God"; the Reference must be to the Deity.

Does not the Parable represent a Shepherd who has lost his Sheep, and when he has found it he calls his Friends together and rejoices?
Yes.

Then according to the Parable he gives Notice to his Friends and Neighbours of what has happened. Would it not seem to be in accordance with the Parable that the Antitype should also give Information?
Certainly; that was my Meaning.

The Antitype being, in this Case, God?
Yes.

Then when the Text says "There is Joy in the Presence of the Angels of God over one Sinner that repenteth" your Construction of it is, that the Angels rejoice in the Presence of God because God Almighty tells them they are to rejoice?
I do not say so; I think it an extremely difficult Passage, remarkably difficult, and the Commentators are greatly divided about the Meaning of it; but I can prove, I think, that the Interpretation given here is not a correct one. "There is Joy in the Presence of the Angels of God." It is the Shepherd that rejoices, and therefore the Joy in the Presence of the Angels of God must be the Joy of God in the Presence of the Angels.

You exclude any rejoicing on the Part of the Angels?
That is not told us here.

Do you think there is in this Note to which you object any thing which, without a strained Construction and a Knowledge of the Controversy before, would render it liable to the Objection that you feel against it; to a plain Reader, who is not aware of that Controversy, do you think it would be objectionable?
I think the Note is taken away from all Controversy, because it alludes to an ordinary Practice of the Roman Catholic Church, which is the Worship of Saints. It says "It is plain that the Spirits of Heaven are interested in our Welfare; they rejoice at our Repentance, and therefore they know when we repent." And therefore they are proper Objects to whom we should address our Prayers.

Can you conceive any Reason why this Note is put in but to favour that particular Doctrine?
I cannot.

Does it in the slightest Degree tend in your Apprehension to explain the Passage?
It does not in the least.

When you state that there is a Controversy upon this Subject, do you mean Controversy amongst Protestant Divines?
Generally among Commentators, as to what the Meaning of it is.

Do any of those Protestant Commentators give a Meaning to it such as the Roman Catholics attach?
No.

Do you mean to say that no Protestant Commentator recognises the Knowledge by Angels of the Repentance of Sinners at the Time that Repentance takes place?
None that I know of. I remember a laboured Argument of Whitby against this Notion as the Roman Catholic Doctrine.

Are there not many orthodox Divines who maintain the Opinion of superintending Angels?
Yes.

Is there any other Note that you consider objectionable?
I think the Note which occurs Two or Three Times in the Scripture Lessons about Penance a most objectionable one.

Where

599

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Where is that?
It is in Page Fourteen.

Will you state in what respects you consider this Note objectionable?
Because I think the clear Construction of the Note would be that the Roman Catholic Translation of μετανοια, "doing Penance," was the right one; it gives Part of what is the Roman Catholic Doctrine of doing Penance, and does not give what the Protestants object to.

What is the Part that you understand not to be given here of the Roman Catholic Doctrine of Penance to which Protestants object?
The Cause for which it is to be done,—Satisfaction for Sin.

Satisfaction to whom?
To the Deity.

That is not expressed here, and you consider that to be notoriously an important Part of the Roman Catholic Doctrine of Penance?
Yes, it is in any common Catechism.

But you say it is not expressed here?
No; this gives Part of the Roman Catholic Doctrine of Penance; and I think on reading that Note any one would imagine that the Roman Catholic Translation was the right View of the Subject, and not the Protestant.

Do you understand the Compilers of these Extracts as saying that they will in all Cases use the Word "repent" regularly?
"The Greek Word here rendered *Repentance*, as well as the kindred Verb rendered *repent*, is in this and several other Passages translated in the Vulgate Latin by *Pœnitentia*, and in the Rheims Version by the English Word (derived from that) *Penance*, which is contracted from *Penitence*. We shall render the Greek Words in question by the English Words *Repentance* or *Penitence* and *repent*."

Is there any other Part of the Scripture Extracts that you think particularly objectionable?
The Part of it which I think the most objectionable is the Mode in which they have given the Lord's Prayer, which would shake the Faith of any Child. In the Sixtieth Page Half the Prayer is put in Brackets, to show that there were Disputes about whether it was the genuine Reading or not; so that a Child who had been taught the Lord's Prayer, as soon as he came to this, would say, "Perhaps what I have been taught is not the Lord's Prayer at all."

Have the goodness to read the Lord's Prayer as it is given in the Scripture Extracts, together with the Note upon it?
It is as follows:—"And he said unto them, When ye pray say [Our] Father [who art in Heaven,] hallowed be thy name: Thy Kingdom come: [Thy will be done, as in Heaven so on Earth.] Give us Day by Day our daily Bread: And forgive us our Sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us:—And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from Evil." Then the Note is, "The Passages enclosed in Brackets in this Prayer are not found in some Manuscripts, and therefore are omitted by many modern Critics, as Griesbach, &c. They are supposed to have been supplied from the parallel Passages in Matthew the 6th. They are omitted in the Armenian and Vulgate Translations. Origen says, that Luke has them not, though Matthew has."

You were understood to say that you thought that the Note at Page 14, about the Word which is translated "Repentance," though it did not state the Roman Catholic Doctrine, suggested the Roman Catholic Doctrine. Does not it upon the Face of the Extracts appear, from their adopting in the Text another Version and putting this Explanation of the Text, that they assert the Version they adopt to be the right one?
If they had said nothing it would, but they have assigned the Reasons why they put it there, and one of those Reasons is, not that it was the best.

They have in fact given an Interpretation of the Word "Repentance," instead of leaving it without any?
Yes.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

And you consider that Interpretation of the Word "Repentance" as marring the plain Meaning of the Word as it occurs in the Text?
I think so.

Have you ever looked into the First Number of the Extracts from the Old Testament?
I have.

Do you recollect the Note on the Third of Genesis, the Fifteenth Verse, relative to the Curse pronounced upon the Serpent?
Yes, I do.

Will you have the goodness to state in what respect you think that Note objectionable?
"It shall crush, &c. ipsa, she, the Woman;" I conceive that Note objectionable because it sanctions the Translation on which the Roman Catholics have founded a Doctrine which I do not consider correct.

What Doctrine?
They refer it to the Virgin Mary.

Do you mean to say that that "she" refers to the Virgin Mary?
It is decided by the Roman Catholic Church.

In grammatical Construction how can it refer to the Virgin Mary? Who is the only Woman mentioned in the whole Work previous to that "she"? Is there any other Woman mentioned besides Eve?
No.

How then can that Word "she" refer to any other Woman than Eve?
It must refer to somebody else; if it applied to Eve it is not true.

What would induce any one to suppose it referred to the Virgin Mary?
The Roman Catholic Church have decided it.

In grammatical Construction how can it refer to the Virgin Mary?
It must refer to some Person different from Eve, because Eve did not crush the Serpent's Head.

That only proves that it might be a false Prophecy, but it does not prove that it refers to some other Person. Is there any other Person who has appeared in the Book previously to that, to whom it could possibly refer in grammatical Construction?
If you take the grammatical Construction there simply, it refers to Eve; but the Roman Catholic Church have decided that it refers to the Virgin Mary.

Where have they decided that?
In Reeves's History of the Bible, which is one of the Books on the List of the National School. It is stated "Mary was the Woman destined by Almighty God to crush the Serpent's Head, as it is written in the Book of Genesis, Chapter the Third."

And your Objection is, that the Note gives a Degree of Currency or apparent Authority to that Construction?
Yes.

But the Text does not adopt the Word "she"?
No; the Text adopts our received Version.

Your Objection is to the Note, and not to the Text?
Yes.

There is before the Committee what professes to be a List of the Books for Roman Catholic Children, which have had the Sanction or Approbation of the Board; will you see whether the Volume to which you have referred is in that List?
It is.

Do you happen to have looked into any other of their Books with a view to see whether this same Statement is exhibited in others of the Books recommended by Members of the Board?
It is, I know, in some; but I have no distinct Recollection of which.

Will you see whether Challoner's Meditations is in the List of the Books before you?
Yes.

Have the goodness to look at Page 385 of that Book, and read a Passage which you will find there?
"For as one Woman by Disobedience in hearkening to the Suggestions of the infernal Serpent was the beginning of all the Maledictions that fell upon Mankind, so one Woman by her humble Obedience to the Proposals brought her by an Angel from Heaven was the beginning of all the Benedictions that were to come upon all Mankind from the blessed Fruit of her Womb; by whom also she crushed that Serpent's Head who first brought Sin and Death amongst us."

That having been stated to the Committee in the Opinion of a Presbyterian Minister to be a gross Heresy, do you concur in that Opinion?
I do.

Do you conceive that any Person who had not been imbued with those heterodox or heretical Notions of the Roman Catholic Church which would induce them to refer the Word "she" to the Virgin Mary could by Possibility suppose that the Virgin Mary was meant by "she" in that Note?
They must look for some Person, as it could not be Eve.

Would you think it otherwise than most objectionable in preparing Books for the joint Instruction of Protestants and Roman Catholics to introduce a Note which has a special Reference to what you conceive to be a gross Heresy of the Church of Rome?
I should think so.

You say it could not be "Eve;" why could it not be "Eve"?
Because she did not bruise the Serpent.

Could not her Seed bruise the Serpent's Head?
Yes; that is the true Interpretation of it.

Might it not be figuratively said that she bruised the Serpent's Head; could not it be so understood figuratively?
It might; but then it would not have the same Meaning.

Have not some learned Divines of the Church of England maintained that "she" was the correct Translation?
Not that I am aware of.

Is not the general Current of Opinion of Commentators upon that Subject, even the most learned Roman Catholics, that the proper Translation is "it"?
Yes.

Is there not some Doubt amongst the best Hebrew Scholars upon the Text?
No, there is no Doubt upon it.

You are a Hebrew Scholar yourself?
I cannot say that I am a Hebrew Scholar; I can translate a Chapter of the Bible in Hebrew, but I do not think I am a Hebrew Scholar.

You were understood to object just now to the Notes, inasmuch as they conveyed the Idea of different Versions of the Scriptures, and therefore led to that Distrust of the Scriptures which you think is likely to follow from the Idea that there are different Versions of them?
That is an Evil likely to result from the critical Notes, I think.

Would you object to a Sermon which, in attempting to explain a particular Text, told you that the Text was very incorrectly stated, and referred to a different Translation?
If it was addressed to Children I should think the Preacher was very ill employed.

To a general Congregation should you object to it?
No, under certain Circumstances I should not.

Rev. C.R.Elrington, D.D.

What Difference is there between introducing the Knowledge of different Versions to a Congregation in that Way, and introducing the Knowledge of different Versions to People through the Medium of Notes or Explanations of this Description?

I should say it was the Difference between grown Persons and Children.

Would you think such a Sermon dangerous for Children to hear?

I do.

Do you think also the Difference is very great between there being in a Sermon perhaps a single Instance of the Kind, and a great Mass of Instances in a Volume of this Sort, that professes to be merely a Statement of the Version of the Scriptures?

Certainly; the Difference is great.

Should you not, on reading those Extracts, be disposed to think that the Compiler of them made his Compilation from a Comparison between the Two Versions, the Protestant and the Roman Catholic, rather than by translating from the Originals?

I should.

Should you not consider that his Object was rather to reconcile it to the Roman Catholic than to the Protestant Version?

Decidedly; through the whole of it I think there appears a Depreciation of the Authorized Version.

From your Observation of the Progress of those Schools since those Scripture Extracts have been in use, can you state whether there has been any Instance, or have you heard of any Instance, of any Protestant Child having, from speculating upon what you consider to be those erroneous Translations of Parts of the Scriptures, formed an Opinion contrary to the Opinions of the Protestant or the Established Church?

I have known no Instance.

You have said that you have not particularly inquired into the State of Management of the Schools, and that you do not know special Instances of Schools?

I do not.

Would it be likely that if such Instances as have been alluded to in the Question just put had occurred they would have come to your Knowledge?

Indeed I do not know.

There is a good deal of Feeling existing against these Schools on the Part of a great Portion of the Clergy of Ireland?

Yes.

And you are known to be hostile to them yourself?

I dare say I am.

Then is not it likely that if such Instances had occurred they would have come to your Knowledge?

I think it is very likely; but I think also that there has not been Time for any thing of the kind.

In point of fact you think it highly exceptionable on account of its own Tendency, whether that Tendency has been effectuated or not?

Yes. I object to disseminating what is not true, be the Consequences what they may.

From the Position you hold in the Church have you been a good deal in Communication with Clergymen of the Established Church relative to these Schools?

I have.

Have they generally interfered to assist and promote these Schools, or have they generally withheld their Support?

They have generally withheld their Assistance, and endeavoured to support the Schools that were in operation before.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Have you the Means of knowing the general Grounds upon which they have so withheld their Support?

I think the general Ground is the withholding of the Scriptures from the Children, and their Objection to this Book of Scripture Extracts.

Have you the Means of stating from your own Knowledge whether any considerable Number of Clergymen in Ireland concur with you in the View you take of the Scripture Extracts?

I am certain that they do.

And you consider that that is one of the Grounds which has induced them to withhold their Countenance?

I do.

On the other hand are there not many Clergymen who are friendly to the System?

I think not many.

Have you any Objection to state what in your Opinion would reconcile the Clergy of the Established Church and the Protestant Community generally to a System of joint Education?

I do not think it is possible in the present State of Ireland to make any One System. I stated at the Commencement my agreeing in Opinion with the Two Commissioners who seceded in 1826, and said that they did not think it possible for One System of Education to be carried through Ireland; Baron Foster and Mr. Glassford.

Supposing that a System of joint Education could be satisfactorily carried on, would you object to the State's affording Assistance to the separate Education of Roman Catholic Children?

I do object to educating them in the Doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

Would you object to applying a Portion of the Funds of the State to giving Moral and Literary Instruction to Roman Catholic Children, leaving it to have its Effect upon their Religious Instruction as it may?

I should rather not have to decide that Question.

Does it occur to your Mind that any Mode could be adopted in which it would be possible for the State to assist in giving Moral and Literary Instruction to Roman Catholics without giving them increased Means of Instruction in their own Religious Creed?

Yes, I think a System of united Education to a certain degree could be given to the Roman Catholics with advantage; but I understood that I was asked about separate Education.

What in your Opinion would satisfy the Protestants, always keeping in your Mind that it is to be a System of joint Education?

I think they would require that the Scriptures should be read in the Schools in the Authorized Version; I think that is a sine quâ non.

Do you mean by all the Scholars?

By all the Scholars that could read; I think so. Stating my own Opinion individually I do not object to Extracts, but I know there are Objections even to Extracts, but individually I have said that I have none.

Are the Committee to understand that you consider that the Protestants of Ireland objected, in Principle, to the System of the Kildare Place Society?

Generally, they did not.

Did not the Kildare Place Society allow the Use of the Douay Version?

They did; but they left it in the Discretion of the Patron; so that a Patron establishing a School under the Kildare Place Society was not bound to use the Douay Version. He could say, I will have none but the authorized Version in my School.

Then it was that Discretion, by which they were enabled to dispense with the Douay Version, which partially reconciled the Kildare Place Society to the Protestants in general?

I know many Persons that had Schools under it that would not have joined it otherwise.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

Would the Protestant Mind in Ireland be reconciled to the Plan of joint Education if there was a Bible Class in every School, in which the Children whose Parents approved of it should read the Bible?

I think they would not be satisfied with that Arrangement.

They would require that the reading of the Bible should be enforced as a Rule of the School upon all the Children without Exception?

I think they would. In the first place, it would be giving up the Principle, and in the next place, I should think, and many others think with me, that it would be introducing worse Evils into the School. For the only Advantage of joint Education is, that it shows the different Children how many Points there are upon which they can agree; it softens Asperities. Now here, if there was any Book, no matter what, in the School that was to be read by one Class and not by another, you divide the School into Two Factions, and you have them enclosed within the same Walls and divided into Religious Parties. Therefore I think that would increase the Evil, and it would be better to have them in separate Schools.

Supposing the reading of the Scriptures was enforced, as you recommend, upon all the Children, would the Protestants in Ireland be satisfied without insisting that in all Cases the Schoolmaster should be a Protestant; provided that there was a proper Security that he should be a competent and well instructed Man, though not a Protestant?

I think that might be conceded in many Instances. However I read a formidable Passage against that to the Committee To-day from this Book, the Passage about the Roman Catholic Prelates requiring the Power of Dismissal. But, as far as regards the Protestants, I think that is a Point that would not be insisted upon. It was not insisted upon in the Kildare Place System. Many of the respectable Schoolmasters were Roman Catholics.

If, for Instance, a System were adopted of trained Schoolmasters, so as to have Men, who would probably, receiving their Pay from the Board and being in a Position of rather a superior Kind to the Hedge Schoolmasters of the Country, be less under the Control of the Priests; if such Persons were occasionally made Schoolmasters, you do not think the Protestants would object to their being Roman Catholics?

I do not; I think that was tried in the Kildare Place System.

You have stated what you think would satisfy the Protestant Mind; do you think that if a Scheme of that Sort was carried into effect the Roman Catholic Children would attend the Schools?

I am certain they would, to a great Number.

Upon what do you ground that Certainty?

Upon Experience.

What Experience?

The Experience of Ireland for the last Twenty Years upon the Kildare Place System, and that of the Association.

Is not one of the Objections to the existing System the Fact that the Bible is now excluded?

Yes.

If a Change took place to the Effect that the Bible should be read in the Schools by all the Children whose Parents had no Objection to it, would not that Objection so far be removed?

No; for it leaves the Principle as it was.

The Principle is now that of Exclusion: would not that Principle of Exclusion be removed by the Fact of the Bible being introduced by the reading of all Children whose Parents did not object to it?

No, I do not think it would; because it would be giving Instruction to the Children which was not founded upon the Bible. It would extend as far as the Children that read the Bible, but it would not extend to those that did not read it.

Would it not admit the Principle of the Admission of the Bible, instead of Exclusion?

Yes; but I do not think that Protestants admit that the Introduction of the Bible is sufficient if it is not read.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Do you believe that a Portion of the Clergy of the Established Church would be more reconciled to the System by such an Alteration?
A very small Proportion. Almost all the Clergy have expressed their Disapprobation of it.

It having been stated to the Committee that in the Province of Munster the Proportion of Protestant Children to Roman Catholic is as 1 to 124, should you think that there would be any Chance of the few Protestants in those Schools being allowed to use the Bible freely in any Case in which a Roman Catholic Priest was the Manager of the School, and a Roman Catholic was also the Teacher?
I should think not; and I should think Mischief would arise if they were.

Then do you conceive from the State of Things in Ireland, especially from the relative Proportions of the Roman Catholics to the Protestants in Three of the Provinces, that there could be no Hope of such a Plan being fairly carried on, even if it were tried?
I should think not.

Do not you believe that the Roman Catholic Population are in general desirous to make use of the Scriptures?
I have every Reason to believe they are.

Then do not you think that in many Cases, when the Option was given to them, they would approve of their Children reading the Scriptures?
I do not.

Then do you think they are so entirely under the Influence of the Priesthood, and that the Priesthood use that Influence so generally, that it would prevent the Operation beneficially of such a Concession?
Where they were admitted into the School without the Condition of reading the Scriptures I think it would.

Then if the Influence of the Priesthood would be so great, why should it not be equally great in preventing the Children going to Schools where the Scriptures are required to be read?
Because the Parents then have the Power of saying, "You are depriving my Child of a good Education. I cannot get the Child educated except he reads the Testament." But in the other Case the Result would be, that there would be Two Parties made, and the Roman Catholic Child that joined the Protestants would be marked out, and Divisions without ceasing would arise from it. You would have every School divided into Factions.

You are aware of the present Construction of the Board, according to which it is considered that there are Representatives in that Board of the different Religious Faiths. Dr. Murray and Mr. Blake are considered to be the Representatives of the Roman Catholic Faith; Mr. Carlile the Representative of the Presbyterian Church; the Archbishop of Dublin and Mr. Sadleir the Representatives of the Church of England. Do you think that those Representatives or that Board have the Confidence of the Clergy of Ireland generally?
They certainly have not.

Do you mean that they have not the Confidence of the Clergy of Ireland as Guardians of the Religious Interests of the Church of Ireland in the Commission?
I do.

Do you know who, in fact, are the efficient Members of the Board?
I cannot say that I know that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Lunæ, 8° *Maii* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

The Rev. CHARLES RICHARD ELRINGTON, D.D., is called in, and further examined as follows:

You were understood to say that you objected to the Note to the Verse in the 15th Chapter of St. Luke, with regard to the "Joy in Heaven over One Sinner that repenteth;" that you thought that Note objectionable, in as far as it imputed that the Angels were cognizant of what was passing upon Earth?

I think I objected to the Phrase of Spirits in Heaven, introduced into the Note as a Substitute for the Angels. I objected to the Use of the Words "Spirits in Heaven;" and I said that it was borrowed from a Note in the old Rheimish Version.

Do you object to the Doctrine, "That the Spirits in Heaven are interested in our Welfare, they rejoice at our Repentance, and therefore they know when we repent"?

I do.

Does your Objection turn upon the Word "Spirits"; would it be removed if the Word "Angels" were substituted?

I do not think it is correct if even "Angels" were used; but the "Spirits in Heaven" makes my Objection quite peremptory to it.

Should you object to it if it had been "the blessed Company of Heaven"?

Yes; I should object to it.

Upon the same Ground?

Upon the same Ground.

Do you consider Archbishop Tillotson an orthodox Divine?

Yes, in a certain Sense, I should; but there are Opinions of Archbishop Tillotson's to which I could not accede.

Should you object to his Orthodoxy if he used the Words "the blessed Company of Heaven" with respect to this very Text as rejoicing?

I should think it was injudiciously selected from his Works if put as a Note in this Place.

Do you think Dr. D'Oyley and Dr. Mant orthodox Divines?

I do.

Do you consider the Family Bible, edited by them, with Notes, a Book which may be safely put into the Hands of any Persons?

I should think so.

Then, if it should turn out that in their Note upon this very Text they quote Archbishop Tillotson, who uses this Expression, "To this Degree does the great God condescend to encourage our Repentance, representing Himself and all the blessed Company of Heaven as transported with Joy at the Conversion of a Sinner;" would that shake your Opinion at all with respect to the Impropriety of this Note?

It does not express the Opinion that the Spirits in Heaven know when we repent, because the Information may be communicated to them by the Diety.

You say that you object to the Idea that the Angels in Heaven, if that had been the Word, are cognizant of what is passing in the Heart of Man?

I said I did not think there was any Authority for it.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

Do you consider that the Divines just mentioned, namely, Archbishop Tillotson, quoted to that Effect by Dr. D'Oyley and Dr. Mant, are good Authority?
They cannot prove that a Doctrine is in Scripture which is not; but I do not think that Passage from Archbishop Tillotson expresses the Opinion I objected to.

Does not it express the Opinion that other Beings besides God Almighty Himself are cognizant of what is passing in the Breast of Man?
I do not think it does; I could not mean to deny that the Deity might have communicated it to the Angels.

Do you think that Expression justifiable, inasmuch as if they do rejoice they rejoice in consequence of a Communication made by the Deity to them upon the Subject?
Yes.

Do you consider that, according to the Analogy of the Parable, it would seem that God does inform the Angels who rejoice with Him upon the Conversion of a Sinner?
I do; I think, as I recollect it, I stated it in my Evidence on the last Day.

Do you happen to have looked at the Note in the original Rheimish Testament?
Yes.

Do you ever recollect to have read Dr. Fulke's Observations upon that Note?
I have read them, but I do not recollect them at this Moment.

Do you consider Dr. Fulke a Divine of great Authority?
Of great Authority, particularly so upon this Subject.

The Note in the Rheimish Testament upon this Passage is as follows: "The Angels and other celestial Spirits in Heaven do rejoice at every Sinner's Conversion; they know them, and have Care of us, yea, our Hearts and inward Repentance be open to them; how then can they not hear our Prayers? and betwixt Angels and the blessed Souls of Saints there is no Difference; in this Case the one being as highly exalted as the other, and as near God, in whom and by whom only they see and know our Affairs, as the other." Now this is Dr. Fulke's Observation:—"Our Hearts and inward Repentance are not known to the Angels but by the Fruits and true Effects thereof, for God only knoweth the Hearts of all the Sons of Men, and their hearty Repentance," referring as Authority for that to the First Book of Kings, Eighth Chapter and Thirty-ninth Verse; do you remember that as being asserted in the Scripture?
Yes.

Dr. Fulke goes on, "And although the Elect, after the Resurrection, shall be like in Glory to the Angels, yet it followeth not that they shall be like in all Things, and much lesse that their Soules now in Heaven be like the Angels, whose Presence and Ministery God useth in the Preservation of His Chosen, in proving the Means of their Conversion and Salvation while they are in this World; and though they be as neere God in Heaven as the Angels, yet it followeth not that either the one or the other see and know our Affaires, otherwise than it pleaseth God to reveale them; for that profane Speculation that God is like a Glasse, in whom all Things done in this World may be seen in Heaven, is a vaine Device of an idle Braine, without all Authority of Scripture, yea, contrary unto it, which teacheth that God one[y] searcheth the Heart and secret Thoughts of Men." Do you remember ever to have read that Passage?
I do.

Do you assent to the Justice of it?
I do.

You consider Hammond a considerable Commentator?
I do; one of our best Commentators.

This being the Comment of Hammond upon that Passage:—"After the same Proportion it is that God expresseth Joy in the Sight of his Angels upon the

the reducing of One Sinner to good Life." Does that appear to you to confirm your View? *Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.*

Certainly.

Do you happen to know Theophylact's Comment upon this Passage?
I do not.

Should you be surprised to find that the Words of Theophylact, whom you consider also a high Authority, were to the same Effect?
I should not be surprised at it; I should expect it.

If you were told that Theophylact says, "In this Passage we are to understand the Wisdom and Word of God in the Shepherd that thus rejoices;" is that what you would expect from such a Commentator?
I should certainly expect it; that is the only Interpretation I can put upon the Passage.

You objected to any Reference being made to different Versions of the Scriptures in any Book put into Children's Hands, inasmuch as you thought the bringing to their Knowledge that there exist different Versions would shake their Belief in any; do you think there is any Chance that any Person at all informed upon this Subject in Ireland should be ignorant that there are different Versions?
I only referred to Children.

Any Child?
Yes.

Do you think that this Book referring to different Versions would communicate to them a Knowledge of that Fact that they had not before?
I should think to a great Proportion of them; to all I might say.

In some Editions, and generally received Editions of the Authorized Version, are there not marginal Notes?
There are some marginal Translations.

In some of those marginal Notes there are Diversities of Versions mentioned?
They are a different Translation.

Should you object to put that Bible into the Hands of any Child?
If I was publishing a Book for the Use of Children I would not introduce those Translations into it for Children; I certainly should not select them.

You are aware that the Douay Version was allowed to be used in the Kildare Place Schools when Roman Catholic Children frequented them?
I am.

Would you say that the Douay Version or the Authorized Version differed essentially in vital Points of Religion?
I would.

Did you ever tell that to any Roman Catholic Children, that between the Authorized Version and the one which they had been accustomed to see or to hear of as having the Sanction of their own Priests there was an essential and wide Difference on fundamental Points of Religion?
I never taught in a School or assisted in a School in which the Douay Version was read, nor ever will.

Did you ever make it known to Roman Catholics of any Kind that you thought there was this vital Difference?
No; for it was a Pledge in the Schools under the Association that no Point of Controversy was to be discussed with the Children there, and so far as I was concerned I religiously kept the Promise.

If it came to the Knowledge of Roman Catholics who had not any Knowledge of the ancient Languages that the Authorized Version is understood by a large Portion of Protestants to contain an essentially different Religion in many fundamental Points from that which is contained in the Version they

Rev.C.R.Elrington. D.D.

have been accustomed to, do not you think that would be likely to cause them to refuse to read the Authorized Version?
It might cause them to refuse it.

Do you think that setting forth those vital Differences which you conceive to exist is a Means, in fact, of deterring the Roman Catholics from acquiescing in the Use, by their Children, of our Authorized Version?
I do not well understand the Meaning of "setting forth."

In proportion as it is believed by the Roman Catholics that the Authorized Version differs in vital and fundamental Points of Religion from the Versions which they have been accustomed to see received by their own Priests, is it not likely that they will object in the same Degree to their Children reading our Authorized Version, which they are taught contains a different Religion from the Versions they have been accustomed to see sanctioned?
I think there can be no Doubt of it.

Do not you think that the Faith altogether of many Persons is likely to be shaken, if, being unlearned Men themselves, they are taught that different Sects of Churches and Christians give a perfectly different Representation, not merely of what is to be inferred from the Scriptures, but of the very Things said by the Sacred Writers themselves?
That is the Objection I think I have been making to giving them different Versions.

But those different Versions you are aware do exist?
Yes.

If they are given to understand that they differ on fundamental Points, will they not naturally say, we cannot refer to the original Languages, and we are told by different Persons who can do so that the Religion is essentially different that is taught according to the different Versions, not merely according to the different Inferences drawn but according to the very Words of the Sacred Writers; therefore there is no Revelation in fact given to us, and we, who are unlearned, can have no Means of knowing what God's Will is; is not that the natural Inference?
Yes; and I think the Difference of Versions is one of the most difficult Questions to answer to an unlearned Person, and therefore I would wish it removed from Children.

Can it be satisfactorily answered at all, supposing there is this fundamental Difference?
I should hope it could.

How would you answer it if the Objection is urged upon you that the Revelation of God is conveyed in a Language which none but the learned can understand, and that there are such Differences of Opinion that the unlearned cannot ascertain what are the essential Points that are revealed to them?
I should endeavour to prove to them that the Doctrines which I thought were revealed in the Bible were the true ones.

But how would you answer the Objection that the unlearned have no Means of ascertaining that at all, and must take the Word each of his own Priest, or must reject the whole, and say that God has not conveyed to us any Knowledge at all of His Will?
The unlearned, to a great Extent, must depend upon Authority.

Whose Authority must they depend upon; must they not depend each upon his own Minister?
I should say upon the Authority of the Church.

Each upon his own Church?
I cannot acknowledge that.

What would you say to an unlearned Man who should ask you first, whether there were essential and vital Differences on Points of Religion between different Versions; and, secondly, how he was to know what was the Will of

611

God; for that the Bible evidently does not contain any Revelation to him of the essential Truths of Christianity? *Rev. G. R. Elrington, D.D.*

The Answer to that Question must depend so much upon the Knowledge of the Individual asking the Question, and upon his Opportunities of Information, and upon the peculiar Objection that he was making, that I could not give any general Formula. I might answer the same Question to Half a Dozen different Persons in totally different Ways.

Supposing the Question to be asked by a Person who has no Knowledge of the original Language?

I can only state that the unlearned must, to a certain Degree, depend upon the Authority of the Church. It is one of the Trials perhaps of their Faith.

Is it not a good Ground of Faith in certain general Facts and Doctrines, to the unlearned, to find various Versions, even the Versions of Persons who differ from each other in their Inferences, agreeing in stating those Facts and Doctrines?

Certainly; and the more you can diminish the Differences between the Versions the more you diminish the Evil arising from different Versions.

Did you ever happen to read his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin's Reply to the Address of his Clergy in 1832?

Yes, I have.

Do you remember a Passage in that which speaks of the Departures from the Language of the Authorized Version in the Scripture Extracts put forth by the Board?

I do not at this Moment.

Will you state whether the following Passage is in your Recollection, that the Archbishop speaks of the Departures from the Language of the Authorized Version actually made in those Scripture Extracts at that Time as "substituting other Words and Phrases for such as have either become obsolete or are otherwise likely to mislead Learners of tender Years"?

Yes, I remember that Passage very well.

Understanding that there is a Difficulty in the Introduction of the Catechisms of any Church in a School of united Instruction, what was the actual Practice of the Association for discountenancing Vice respecting the Use of Catechisms in the Schools?

I am glad to be asked that Question, for it gives me an Opportunity of explaining what perhaps might be liable to some Ambiguity in the Evidence I gave on the last Day, when my Attention was solely directed to contrasting the Obligation of the Scriptures being read in the Hours of School and the Catechism not. The Rule of the Association is simply that no Catechism is to be taught except the Catechism of the Church of England; but though the Rule is thus put negatively the Association requires a Return of those who learn the Catechism, as appears by the printed Queries that I gave in to your Lordships on the last Day; but whether the Instruction be given on every Day in the Week or only on some Days, whether it be given during School Hours or not during School Hours, whether it be given in the Schoolhouse or in the Church, whether it be given by the Clergyman, keeping to himself the Class for Instruction, or, as is the general Practice, employing the Schoolmaster as an Assistant, those are Questions that the Association never asks; they are content with the Certificate of the Clergyman that the Catechism is taught, and with the Fact that no Complaint is made of any Interference with other Religious Creeds; and therefore I would beg to say, that if that System of united Scriptural Education should ever again engage the Attention of Parliament, and it should be thought objectionable to have even the Name of Catechetical Instruction attached to those Schools of united Education, it might be removed from the Schoolhouse without interfering with the Principles of the Association, getting, as they would, from the Clergyman a Return of his instructing them in the Catechism, that they might be aware that they were not giving Literary Instruction to Children of the Established Church without a proper Religious Education added to it. Those are all the Cautions that we adopt.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

It having been said that the Association in One of its Volumes of Scripture Extracts omitted certain Verses in the First Chapter of Saint Luke, especially the Thirty-fourth Verse, which relates, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man;" will you state what is the Fact with respect to this Matter?
The Association never published any Extracts of the New Testament.

Did it ever, in any Volumes of the History of the Old and New Testament, profess to exhibit that Passage of Saint Luke's Gospel that contains the Annunciation?
Mrs. Trimmer's Extracts from the New Testament was on the List of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and therefore so far might be purchased by the Members of the Association; but they never were on the List of the Association Books, nor ever sold at reduced Prices by them.

Then in point of fact the Association for discountenancing Vice did not in any of its Publications omit this particular Verse alluded to?
Never.

You were understood to say upon the former Day that you objected to Education that did not include Religious Education; and you were also understood to say that by Religious Education you chiefly meant the reading of the Scriptures, or at least that that was a necessary Part of Religious Education. Now with reference to reading the Scriptures, do you found that Opinion upon Authority, that is, upon the Authority of Holy Writ, or of the Doctrine of the Church of England?
I conceive it is the true Protestant Principle.

Then you do not conceive it expressly enjoined by the Authority of Scripture?
Yes, I do think it is put forward by Scripture, that every Individual should read the Scriptures.

Do you suppose it was the Practice of the primitive Church to teach the Scriptures without Comment, that is, simply the reading of the Scriptures?
Certainly; I think it was their Practice to teach the Scriptures; reading was not common then as it is now, but they taught the Scriptures, which they might do, by reading it to Children. Books also were not so abundant as they are now; but I think there are Abundance of Passages in the Epistles which establish the Fact.

Do you suppose it was the Practice of the Reformed Church, soon after the Reformation, to read Scriptures to Children, or to cause Children to read the Scriptures without Note or Comment?
I think it was their Practice to teach Children the Scriptures, but the teaching it without Note or Comment, as I stated in my last Day's Examination, is a Compliance with the unfortunate State of Ireland, and by no means what I would recommend; I suffer it, but I do not recommend it.

Then are you understood to say that in a good and wholesome State of Society you would recommend that the Scriptures should be taught with Note and Comment, but not without Note and Comment, to Children?
Most assuredly to any Children that I was educating I would explain the Scriptures as far as I could.

But you would not teach them without Explanation?
Certainly not; I should conceive myself criminal where the Opportunity was given if I did not afford the additional Instruction.

Do you conceive it desirable upon the whole that the Labouring Classes should learn to read?
If Religious Education is given with it, I do; if it is not, I do not.

Supposing that there is a large Portion of them who would refuse, not all Religious Education, but such Religious Education as you could conscientiously give, would you think it better that they should remain unable to read?
Certainly if I could not add Religious Education I would leave them uneducated.

Would you prefer that the Children of Roman Catholic Parents should have

no Education at all, than that they should be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith? *Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.*

That is a Question that I cannot give an Answer to; if your Lordship asks me whether I would assist in giving them the Education, I say at once "No; I would give them no Education but what they may get in the ordinary course from their own Pastors."

When you say you would not assist them to obtain any Information if they were to be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith, do you say that as an Individual, or do you mean to say that the State ought not to do so?

I do not give any Answer about the State; I speak as an Individual.

You were understood to say that you would rather not answer the Question put to you before, as to whether you think it better that Children should have no Education and no Religious Education at all, than that they should be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith, where, you observe, the Question is, not between the Protestant Faith and the Roman Catholic Faith, but between the Roman Catholic Faith and no Christian Faith whatever?

If the Question is whether it is better that a Child should be a Roman Catholic or an Infidel, I must answer the Question at once; there can be no Hesitation about that.

Then would you prefer that the Children should have no Literary Education, if it was necessarily accompanied by Education in the Roman Catholic Faith, than that they should have Literary Education though they were at the same Time instructed in the Roman Catholic Faith?

I would prefer that there was no Literary Education given, unless there was some Religious Education given with it; but if you add to that the peculiar Doctrines of any Religion that I think untrue, I must object to them.

Do you mean that you would object to any Literary Education being given unless accompanied by Religious Instruction in the particular Doctrines of the Church of England, you believing those to be the true Doctrines?

No; because I stated before that in the peculiar Circumstances of the Division of Religious Feeling in Ireland I would take the lowest Grade of Religious Education that I could possibly think would be useful along with the Literary Education; that I conceive to be the reading of the Scriptures; and I would consent to Literary Education, and promote it along with that Part of Religious Education; but if there be added to that any Instruction in any Religious Creed which I think wrong I must withdraw my Consent.

You mean the Scriptures in the Authorized Version exclusively adopted by the Church of England?

In the Authorized Version exclusively. I cannot recommend any other.

Were you rightly understood to say that it is your Belief that Roman Catholic Children in Ireland exist and can grow up ignorant that there is another Version besides the Authorized Version?

I never said any thing about Roman Catholic Children; my sole Argument was as to the Injury that it was to Protestant Children.

Do you conceive that those Protestant Children might grow up and pass through Life in Ireland not aware that there exists any but the Authorized Version?

No, I do not think they could.

But would not that Knowledge that there was a different Version lay them open to all those Dangers you have spoken of?

I beg leave to say that the Question has added to the Word "Children" their passing through Life.

Then is this your Distinction, that if they continue as Children ignorant that there is more than One Version, your Objection would not be the same although they should afterwards come to the Knowledge that there were more?

I conceive that Protestant Children might be educated thinking that there was but One Version of the Scriptures, or taught that there was but One true Version of them.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Would they not become open to all the Dangers you have spoken of as soon as they came to the Knowledge that they had been kept in the Dark upon this Point, and that there was another Version?
They would be better able to resist the Attacks.

Your Opinion is that the chief Danger is in Childhood?
Yes.

Do you think they would be more able to resist the Attacks when they came to the Knowledge that there were other Versions, in the Consciousness that it had been carefully concealed from them that any such Versions existed?
Yes; for I do not think the Fact of the Difference of Versions being made known to them when Children would increase their Preparation for meeting the Arguments in after Life.

If a Roman Catholic Child is not taught to read, what Chance has he afterwards of becoming acquainted with the Bible?
I think Persons that do not read might become acquainted with the Bible.

In what Way?
It might be read to them.

If you teach the Children of a Country to read, will it not very much facilitate their becoming acquainted with the Bible in after Life?
That may be a possible Contingency; but I conceive that giving Literary Instruction without Religion is a positive Evil, and I will not do an Evil that Good may possibly come of it.

Do not you think it better that the Children should read Extracts from the Bible than that they should not read any thing at all about the Bible?
Certainly; and I have expressed in the strongest Terms in my last Examination that I have no Objection to Extracts, as Extracts.

Meaning Extracts from the Authorized Version exclusively?
Yes.

Have you read the Books given to the Schools by the Board of Commissioners?
I cannot say that I have read them all through, but I am acquainted with them to a certain Degree; I have many of them read in my own School.

Do you think that if the System of National Education as it is now established were abandoned there would not be many Thousands of Catholic Children that are now taught that would have no Instruction at all?
Indeed I do not.

How do you think that their Education would be provided for?
The Number of Roman Catholic Children receiving Education before the Board was established was so very considerable that I think it could be restored again; and that if the Board had not existed at all the Number would have been very great indeed now.

How many were educated before the Board was established?
I do not wish to give the Numbers from Memory, but it is in Evidence on your Lordship's Minutes that in 1826 there were 500,000 Children educated in Ireland. In the Report published by the Commission of which Mr. Frankland Lewis was Chairman it is stated that in 1812 there were 200,000 Children; that there was an Increase in the Scriptural Schools of 300,000 between that Time and 1824; and it is stated distinctly in that Book that in 1824 or 1825 there were 6,000 Schools in Ireland in which Scriptural Education was given, 1,900 of which, as I recollect, were connected with Societies, and the others not.

Do you mean that that Report states that there were 500,000 Children at Schools were the Scriptures where read without Note and Comment?
Yes; it is in the Report. I may be wrong in the precise Number, but I think I am not; I refer, however, your Lordships to the Report of the Commissioners.

You mean the Second Report of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry in Ireland?
Yes. This is what is stated in their Report: In 1812 the Number of Children

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Children attending Scriptural Schools was 200,000. Then they say that in 1825 the Increase upon Schools where the Scriptures are taught is 368,812, and out of this Number the only Duplicates they state are the Sunday School Children, and for those you may take off 80,000, and the Increase in the Schools where the Scriptures are read will be 288,812. The Scriptures are read in 6,058 Schools, besides 1,945 Sunday Schools; of those 1,879 are connected with the Scriptural Societies, therefore 4,179 are voluntary Schools.

By voluntary Schools, do you mean pay Schools?
No; voluntary Schools that were not under any Society. This I give upon the Authority of the Report.

There is nothing that prevents the Children attending the National Schools under the present System going to Sunday Schools?
I am not aware that there is.

Do not you know that many go to the Sunday Schools?
I do not; because in my Part of the Country very few Protestants attend the National Schools at all; only about Twenty in the whole County of Wexford.

Do you know how many Children are in course of Education in Ireland?
I do not.

Is it your Opinion, as far as you can form an Opinion, that there has been an Increase or Diminution in the Number of Children in Ireland attending Schools where the Scriptures are taught, in consequence of the Establishment of the National Board of Schools?
I have no Doubt that there has been a Diminution of the Number attending.

To a great Extent?
I should say to a great Extent.

Can you give any Estimate of the Extent?
I cannot.

You have stated that in the Association Schools the Principle was, of no Interference with the Religious Creed of any Children that came in, any further than by reading the Scriptures. Now you must be aware that the Roman Catholic Children who did in some Instances attend the Association Schools were instructed by their Priests, or at least were likely to be so, to put such and such Interpretations upon Scripture. You did not tell him for instance, in the Association Schools, that Transubstantiation was a false Doctrine, or that the Invocation of Saints was false, or that the other various peculiar Tenets of the Roman Catholic Church were erroneous; and you are aware that the Priests were likely to give their own Interpretation of the Scriptures?
Certainly.

Might it not be said, that giving Education to Children who were left in the Hands of those who you knew would teach them what you considered erroneous would be doing Evil that Good might come?
No; because I put the best Safeguard into their Possession that was in my Power; I put the Scriptures into their Hands.

But you are aware that those Scriptures are interpreted by each Sect and Church according to their own peculiar Views?
Of course.

Do you consider that the erroneous Doctrines of certain other Churches and Sects are taught in the National System, or is your Objection only that the System leaves the Children to be taught at other Times the peculiar Religious Tenets of their own Parents and Guardians?
I have stated in my former Examination that I conceived that the Scripture Extracts were leading the Children away from what I conceived the true Interpretation of Scripture.

Then you conceive that if the Scripture Extracts were free from those Errors which you attribute to them, the mere Circumstance that the Children were left

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

to be instructed by their respective Pastors in their peculiar Religious Tenets would not form any insuperable Objection to the System?

That is a Part of the National System that I never could understand, as to the leaving the Children to their own Pastors, for surely the Pastors of the different Religions had the Right, and the Board of National Education could not interfere with it. I had a Right to teach the Children at any Time I pleased, without the Board of National Education giving me Leave, as they have done; it is a Part of the System that I never could understand.

The Question is, whether your only Objection was to those supposed Religious Errors in the Extracts?

It is not simply because I objected to the Extracts; I objected to their not being made compulsory; I objected to its not being necessary that any Portion of the Scriptures should be read in the Schools.

Do you object to the Pastors of the Two Religions instructing the Children in their Religious Tenets?

I cannot object to that.

But do you object to their being invited to attend the Schools at convenient Seasons for that Purpose?

I think that objectionable; I stated it in my Evidence before, not as my own Objection, but as an Objection that was generally made by the Clergy in Ireland; however, I do think it objectionable.

Then are the Committee to understand that if the Extracts were unobjectionable in themselves, and the Use of them rendered compulsory in the Schools, you would not found any Objection to the National Schools upon the Circumstance of private Religious Education being given by the Pastors of the different Sects to their own Children?

Certainly I should not; I do not think I have any Right to interfere in that.

You have been asked whether you would see it wrong to allow the Children to be taught in the Schools without entering into controversial Points, when their Pastors might out of School teach them what you think erroneous Doctrine; and you said, that you would not do Evil that Good might come; would it not rather be that you would omit to do Good lest Evil should come?

To that Question, certainly.

Objecting as you do to the Extracts used by the Board, is it your Opinion that Extracts from Scripture could be so compiled as to be free from Objection to both Classes of Religionists in Ireland?

Yes; and I did assist in drawing such up for the Commissioners of Education in 1826.

Was it objected to on the Part of the Clergy of any Persuasion?

Yes; it was objected to by the Four Roman Catholic Archbishops.

Then it was not free from Objection from the Clergy of any Persuasion?

The only Objection that they made to it, as stated in their Letter, was that it was in the Words of the Authorized Version. The Order that the Committee received, of which I was one, was to found the Extracts upon a Russian Book that was then published; a Book for the Use of the Russian Schools (the Title of which at this Moment I forget); a Sort of Harmony of the Gospels; and not to put any Passage into the Extracts in which there was a Diversity of Translation between the Authorized Version and the Douay, and we did accomplish our Task; there is not a Verse in it that is differently translated. The Harmony was published by the Commissioners in their Report.

Then the Objection of the Roman Catholic Archbishops was made to this because it was in the Language of the Authorized Version; was it not also in the Language of the Douay Version?

As to Meaning it was, but there might be another Word of the same Meaning, or the Arrangement of the Sentence might be different, but there was no Diversity of Meaning whatever.

And the Roman Catholic Prelates admitted that there was no Diversity of Meaning?

They did; they made the Version their sole Objection. The whole Correspondence is published at the End of the Ninth Report of the Commissioners in 1826.

From what you have seen of the Extracts published by the Board, are you not aware that in many Cases they depart both from the Authorized and the Douay Version; and that there has been no Objection made on that Account by the Roman Catholic Prelates?

Yes; but in a Part of his Letter Dr. Murray directly states that he would not admit any Book purporting to be Extracts from Scripture that was not altogether in the Language of the Douay.

To what Version do the Scripture Extracts now adhere?

To none exclusively.

It professes to be an independent Version?

It does; it is a Version of the Translators.

To what do you attribute the Consent of the Roman Catholic Archbishops to the Scripture Extracts recommended by the Board when they objected to any except what is in omnibus according to the Douay Version?

I cannot reconcile their Conduct; it appears to me a direct Inconsistency.

Will you look to Page 7. of the Second Volume of the Scripture Extracts of the New Testament, where you find the Words, "And there appeared Tongues like as of Fire, distributed among them;" does it appear to you that that is more or less correct than the Authorized Version?

I should say it was more correct.

Do you remember what the Vulgate has?

Not at this Moment.

Do you think it is objectionable, though it is more correct than the Authorized Version, to be given to Children?

I do object to it.

Though it is more correct?

Though the individual Instance is more correct.

Do you recollect that it is "dispartitæ" in the Vulgate?

Yes, I believe it is.

And that you conceive to be rendered, and correctly rendered, by the Word "distributed"?

Yes.

You have observed the Word "Demons" very often occurring in place of the Word "Devils" in the Authorized Version; which would you say would convey the clearer Idea of the Sense of the Original?

"Demons" would, I should think.

Because the Word "Devil" is never used in the Plural Number?

No.

On a former Day you objected to the Way in which the Lord's Prayer was printed by introducing Brackets; are you not aware that that only exhibits exactly the Difference of Opinion of many Commentators upon the Lord's Prayer as it is in St. Luke?

I am perfectly aware of that.

Then what you object to is, that People should be informed of that which is the Fact?

That Children should be informed of those Disputes I do think most dangerous.

The Lord's Prayer as it is given by St. Luke is given differently from what it is by St. Matthew?

That is a disputed Point. It is stated that some Persons supposed that those Passages in Brackets have been copied from St. Matthew.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

In the Authorized Version is the Lord's Prayer precisely the same in St. Luke as in St. Matthew?
No; for the Doxology is in one and not in the other.

Is there no other Difference?
There is the Word "Debts" in one, and "Offences" in the other.

Which do you consider to be the Lord's Prayer that is in common Use; that taken from Matthew, or that taken from Luke?
In our Liturgy both are used, for we use it sometimes without the Doxology and sometimes with it; but if I recollect rightly I think it is not accurately either.

You are aware that the Doxology is considered by many of the oldest Critics not to be a Part of it in Matthew?
Yes.

You think it highly undesirable that Children should have their Minds distracted upon the Subject of the Sacredness of the Lord's Prayer by critical Questions as to whether certain Readings appear to certain Commentators to be true or false?
I do think it most dangerous, and it was the most startling Thing to me that could be, its being so rendered; and I believe it is the only Instance in which it has been printed in that Form for the Instruction of Children.

Is it not the very earliest Prayer that is taught to a Protestant Child?
It is.

Then you conceive that a Child having so learned the Lord's Prayer, and understanding it to be the Lord's Prayer, should not have his Mind shaken or distracted by finding that there are other Ways of translating or repeating it?
That is decidedly my Opinion.

Then do you think that the Chapter of St. Luke in which the Lord's Prayer is ought not to be read to a Child?
I do not think it ought not to be read.

Is the Lord's Prayer as it is given in St. Luke the ordinary Formula of the Lord's Prayer?
No; the Version in the Liturgy differs in some minute Turn of the Phrases. It is a most difficult Thing to keep distinct in the Memory the separate Versions of a Thing that is most familiar to you.

Have the Commissioners given a Translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew?
No.

Do you consider that any Doubt is thrown upon the Divine Inspiration and Authenticity of the Gospel of St. Luke by the Brackets put there?
Not upon the Gospel of St. Luke, but upon the Lord's Prayer; that is what the Brackets mean.

Do not the Opinions of the best Commentators justify those Brackets?
Yes; but I never saw them put in a Book for the Instruction of a Child before.

Have you read the Volume of Sacred Poetry given to the Children by the National Board?
I cannot say that I have; I know some of it.

Do you object to that being put into the Hands of Children?
No; I have not said any thing that would imply an Objection to many of the Books. I have mentioned already that I have used some of them myself in my own School.

Do not you think that the teaching Children these Extracts gives them a Desire afterwards to become acquainted with the Book from which these Extracts are made?
I have expressed over and over again that I have no Objection to Extracts; and I think a Religious Education can be carried on by Extracts.

You were asked about these Extracts?
To these Extracts I have objected over and over again.

619

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

And you would object to the use of these Extracts, though that good Effect might accidentally follow, because you would not do Evil that Good might come?

Certainly.

Do not you think that much Good will come by making the Children anxiously desirous in after Life of consulting the Bible?

If that Effect could be produced much Good would arise, certainly.

You are understood to say that you object to different Versions being put into the Hands of Children, inasmuch as it tends to shake their Faith when they see the Words are different. Now the following is the Lord's Prayer as it is in St. Matthew: "Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this Day our daily Bread. And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors. And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from Evil: For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever. Amen." The following is the Lord's Prayer as it is in St. Luke: "Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth. Give us Day by Day our daily Bread. And forgive us our Sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into Temptation; but deliver us from Evil." You will observe that neither of those is precisely the same as the Lord's Prayer as it is used in our Liturgy. Do you think that any Danger arises to any Child with respect to its Faith from the Difference of those Three Versions?

No; for in the first place one of those is taken from St. Matthew, and another from St. Luke. It does not appear that the Lord's Prayer in those Two Evangelists was delivered at the same Time; therefore the Child may be easily taught that those are not different Versions of the same Thing. There is not a Mark of Uncertainty attached to any Verse in St. Matthew, or to any Verse in St. Luke, and that is what I would object to.

Then you do not object to Two different Versions in the Bible, because it does not appear that they were delivered by our Saviour at the same Period?

They are like other Narratives of the Evangelists, which give the same Things recorded in different Words.

Then what Explanation would you give to a Child of the Third Version, which is the Version adopted in the Liturgy, which is universally taught to Children?

It is the same in effect as this; it only varies in Phrase; it was translated at a different Time from this.

But you were understood to say that you objected to different Versions on account of the Difference of the Phrases, and that same Objection exists in the present Case to the Use of the Lord's Prayer as it is adopted in the Liturgy, and that is used by Children universally; how do you reconcile those Two Answers?

Their unavoidable Difference, which I think of very little Consequence, could be no Argument with me for authorizing an Increase of those Differences where there was no Advantage to be derived from it, and Evils necessarily following.

Is it not the Fact that there are many Passages in the Greek which are verbatim the same in the Greek in different Parts, and which are not translated verbatim the same in the Authorized Version?

There are some such Passages.

Should you think a Version which translated those Passages verbatim the same in every Case where they occur a dangerous Version to put into the Hands of Children?

I do think it dangerous to increase the Number of Versions given to a Child, for whatever Cause it may be done.

Then are the Committee to understand that you would go this Length; that you would rather persevere in the same Course with the same Version that is erroneous, than correct that Error at the Risk of producing the Dangers which you think would occur from Change?

I should not begin the Correction of the Error with Children.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

Then you would bring them up in Error, with a view of correcting it after they were grown up?
I never would voluntarily bring up a Child in Error.

Then how do you reconcile that with your last Answer?
I was careless in the Use of the Word; I understood by the first Question that was put to me that it was only as to the Preference, one Translation to another.

It was as to the Preference of a correct Translation to an erroneous Translation?
But not a Translation that involves Error.

But the Question is put with respect to a Version that does involve Error, as compared with one in which the Error is corrected?
I could not sanction the Circulation of any Version that I conceived communicated Error.

Then if you object to the Word "Error," substitute for that Word "a less correct Translation"?
Then I certainly would not multiply Versions for the Purpose of making that Correction to Children, where the Difference of the Two Translations was unimportant.

You do not think that those Variations in Interpretation or Inversion involve Errors so material as to require you to place in the Hands of the Children Evidence of those Errors?
I do not think them deserving of it.

The pronouncing a Part of the Authorized Version to be correct or incorrect is giving the Authority of an Individual in contradiction to the Authority of the Church; is it not?
Yes.

Then even if you were satisfied in your own Judgment that a few particular Points were wrong in the Translation, and might be given more correctly, would you, or would you not, think it extremely dangerous to introduce the Principle of an Individual, or a few private Individuals, on their own Authority, setting up what they thought a more correct Translation than the Translation of the Church?
I should certainly think so.

And that one Consideration would stop you from taking any Steps to secure the Use of a Version which in a few small Points you might consider individually more correct than the Authorized Version?
Yes.

Does not it follow of Necessity that if there are Two long Passages which are verbatim the same in the Original, but are given differently in the Translation, that one or the other of the Versions must be incorrect?
No; I can conceive Two Translations of the same Passage different from each other, and yet both substantially correct.

Must not one be more correct than the other?
I think not necessarily; I think any Two Persons translating a Passage will translate it differently, and yet both Persons may translate it correctly.

You were understood to affirm that it would be dangerous to admit the private Interpretations of Individuals when they were opposed to the Version authorized by the Church; do not you think that militates in some degree against the Right of private Judgment of the Scriptures?
No; I think any Person has a Right, and it has always been exerted by some of the best Members of the Church, to suggest a different Translation of the Scriptures.

And Interpretation?
A different Translation and Interpretation from the Authorized Version, but that is for the learned.

For the learned only?
For the learned only, I consider.

Rev.C.R.Elrington, D.D.

You said that you considered the Lord's Prayer, as ordinarily used in the Liturgy, as not being at all at variance, even verbally, with that which appears in Luke; because in fact it appears that they were delivered on different Occasions; and Children may read it in Luke, and learn the Lord's Prayer as it is in Matthew, without being at all unsettled in their Minds; then in fact, as the Extracts do not give the Prayer as it is in the Gospel of Matthew, but what you have referred to as a Prayer delivered probably on another Occasion, does not it follow that they do not interfere with the Lord's Prayer as a common Liturgical Prayer at all?
I object to their putting a Mark of Doubt upon any of the Passages in the Prayer; I object to the Mode of publishing it with these Brackets. The marking of these Brackets means that certain Commentators have considered that those Passages are not genuine.

Do you mean that that applies to any Passage whatever, or to the Lord's Prayer especially, on the Ground of its being a Prayer which Children are taught to reverence?
I object to it in any Passage, but I object to it more particularly in the Lord's Prayer.

But as the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in Luke are considered as having been delivered on different Occasions, and our ordinary Liturgical Prayer is taken from Matthew, does not that Circumstance remove the Objection as far as applies to that Prayer particularly; that is to say, that the Extracts do not in fact meddle with that particular Portion of Scripture from which it is taken as a Prayer?
The Objection that I have been most strongly urging against the Manner in which the Lord's Prayer is given in the Extract is not from the Diversity of Version, but from the Marks of Doubt as to Authenticity.

And you think that if a Person in after Life finds that it has been carefully concealed from him for a long Time that there are different Readings in some non-essential Points, and different Versions of some Greek Words, that that would not tend to shake his Belief so much as if he was early taught that there was an Agreement in some, but that there were different Versions of others?
I would rather that the Information was not given in Childhood.

Do you consider that the Circumstance of exhibiting this Prayer in the Way in which it is exhibited in the Bible, and declining to give it with those Brackets and Symbols of various Reading, is in fact a careful Concealment from the Party of any Circumstance about it?
I do not think it is.

You think it is merely pursuing the Course which Common Sense dictates in teaching Children what they are to learn upon Authority?
Yes.

Why do you confine the Right of private Judgment and Interpretation of the Scriptures to the learned?
I do not confine it to them. What I said was, that some of the best Members of the Church of England had published Translations of different Parts of Scripture, but I conceived those were for the learned, and not for the Education of Children. I should conceive that the Differences between Lowth's Translation of Isaiah and the Authorized Version were not a fit Subject for the Instruction of Children.

How early do you conceive that the Church of England put in practice what you have termed the Protestant Principle of teaching the Scriptures to Children?
I conceive always.

Do you think it was done in the Schools in the Reign of Elizabeth?
Yes, I am sure it was, as far as Copies of the Scriptures were provided; Copies of the Scriptures were not so common as they are now, but they were not withheld.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Is not it notorious that Copies of the Scriptures were provided at a Stand to be read publicly by all Persons who chose to go to them?
Certainly; chained to the Desks in the Churches.

Is it not notorious that in the earliest Times since the Reformation the reading of the Scriptures has been put forward by the Church of England as its distinctive Character?
Always.

Was not it one of the distinctive Characters of the Churches between the Reformation and the Roman Catholic Church?
It was.

You say that the Scriptures were provided in the Churches; but the Question referred to the Schools, not to the Churches; were there any Bibles in the Schools exposed for reading?
I really cannot say; I am not aware of any Records that could give me the Information.

Are the Committee to understand that in the Schools of that Period the Scriptures were read by the Children?
I really cannot tell; I should suppose they were; but I have no Record from which I can adduce the Fact.

Have you any Reason to suppose that in the Reigns of Anne and the Two first Georges it was the habit to cause the Children to read the Scriptures in the Schools throughout England?
I never harboured a Doubt upon the Subject; I believe that it was, but I cannot prove it.

In the Schools in later Years in the different Parishes in England do you suppose that on Week Days the Children have constantly been in the habit of reading the Scriptures?
I should suppose they were; but I am very little conversant with the System of Education pursued in the Schools in England; I never was in a School in England.

In what authorized Document has the Church of England sanctioned the Principle that you have stated to be the Protestant Principle, of teaching the Scriptures to Children?
I do not know any Document in which that precise Thing is put forward.

In the public Schools of England at this Moment, do you suppose that the Scriptures are read to all Classes of the Children in School?
I really should suppose so; but again I say I know nothing of the Mode of Parochial Education in England; I never was in a Parochial School in England in my Life.

The Question was not intended to be confined to Parochial Schools, but to Schools of Royal Foundation, and such as are supposed to be particularly under the Inspection of the Prelates and Clergy of the Church of England, including Westminster and Eton and Harrow?
From Eton downwards I never saw the System of Education pursued in any School; I never saw Children taught in any School in England, either classical or parochial.

Is it the habit at the present Day in the Diocesan Schools in Ireland to read the Scriptures?
Yes.

How long do you suppose that to have been the habit?
I know I was sent to the Diocesan School of Carlow Thirty-eight Years ago, and it was the Practice then to read the Scriptures, and teach the Catechism.

Do you think that the Objection to the Scripture Extracts of the National Board can consistently be made by a Supporter of the Kildare Place Society, where the Douay Bible was admitted?
He cannot object to the Difference of Versions; but many Persons will

object, as I mentioned before, to Extracts, and insist upon the Bible being admitted into the School.

Rev. C. R. Elrington, D.D.

Is it not conceivable that a Supporter of the Kildare Place Society, though he might not object to those Extracts upon the Ground of their varying from the Authorized Version, might yet object to those Extracts as being in themselves full of Matter that is wrong?

He might possibly object to the critical Notes, but except that I do not think he could.

Supposing the Douay Version were permitted under the Kildare Place System, and that that Permission was solely for the Use of the Roman Catholic Children, might not a Friend of that System still object to that Book of Extracts being required for the Use of the Children of both Religious Persuasions?

Certainly; and the Patron of a School under the Kildare Place Society was not obliged to admit the Douay Version; he could restrict it to the Authorized Version, or he might object to the Authorized Version and restrict it to the Douay, or he might admit both.

Did you state to the House of Commons that the Archbishop of Dublin did not possess the Confidence of the Protestants of Ireland?

I was asked that Question, which I deprecated being asked, and I said that I requested that it might be understood that I answered it simply as Matter of Fact. The Question was this: Whether the Clergy of the Established Church thought that the Archbishop of Dublin and Dr. Sadleir truly represented their Interests; and I stated, as a Fact, that the Clergy did not think they were represented.

Is it possible for any Archbishop of Dublin to possess the Confidence of a large Portion of the Protestant Clergy of that Country if he does not side with what is called the Evangelical Party?

I would deprecate these Questions; I answered the Question in the Commons, and specially answered it as Matter of Fact, and begged it to be understood that I answered it as Matter of Fact. It was a very unpleasant Question for me to answer, and I hope your Lordship will not press it.

Would you dislike to give the Reasons why you think that the Archbishop of Dublin and Dr. Sadleir have not the Confidence of the Protestants?

Yes, I should deprecate it extremely. I have been honoured with great Attention by the Archbishop of Dublin; I am his Chaplain; and I have lived on Habits of Intimacy with Dr. Sadleir all my Life; and a more unpleasant Question could not be put to me.

Were you acquainted with Dr. Cleaver when he was Archbishop of Dublin?

I was not.

Do you happen to know whether he had or not the Confidence of the Clergy of his Diocese?

He was only for Six or Seven Months Archbishop of Dublin; that is, he was only in Health for that Length of Time.

In point of fact, are the Clergy of the Archdiocese of Dublin much divided into Parties?

They are.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. LEWIS MILLS is called in, and examined as follows:

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Have you been much accustomed to the Schools in Ireland?

I have.

What particular Opportunities have you had of making yourself acquainted with them?

I have been engaged in visiting the Schools in connexion with the Kildare Place Society for about Eighteen Years past.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Are you Inspector of any other Society?
I have been very recently appointed Inspector to the Schools under the Board of Erasmus Smyth.

During the Eighteen Years in which you have been Inspector for the Kildare Place Society have you been in the habit of informing yourself of the State of the Schools in general belonging to other Societies?
I have; I have visited Schools of every Description for the Education of the Poor in different Parts of the Country.

Have you seen many of the National Schools?
I have visited a good many of them.

When did you begin to visit them?
I commenced visiting them very shortly after they were first established.

Have you made Notes of the Results of your Inspection?
I have been in the habit of making Notes at all Times of the Schools that I have officially visited, and frequently of others.

Was it your Object to go to those Schools separately, or when you were in the Course of your Inspection of the Kildare Place Society Schools?
I will just explain the first Cause of my visiting those Schools. Shortly after the Establishment of the Board a good many Kildare Place Schools were placed under the Board; those Schools were furnished to me upon my Lists upon leaving Dublin; the Consequence was, that I was under the Necessity of visiting in the first instance, because I was obliged to make a Report to the Society, the Schools actually upon my Lists.

At the Time when you began the Inspection of the Schools of the Board in the Country, in what State did you generally find them; were they as good then, as full of useful Instruction, in your Opinion, as they appear to be now?
No, I do not think they were.

At this Time what appeared to you to be the great Defects in the Schools of the Board generally?
They were not supplied with the Scripture Lessons, at least in very few Instances, after they were established, owing to the Circumstance of the Scripture Lessons not having been then all published.

Were they well supplied with Books of any Sort at that Time?
Certainly not so well as they subsequently have been.

At that Period was there any thing in the Schools, generally speaking, of the National Board, which indicated that they were more in the Hands of one Religious Persuasion than of another?
They have been, as far as my Knowledge of them extends, with the Exception of Parts of the North of Ireland, in the Hands of the Roman Catholic Clergy generally in every other Part of the Kingdom, and they are so now, as far as I can judge.

Did you often find that Books of special Roman Catholic Instruction were used at Times that according to the Rules were devoted to general Literary Instruction?
Very frequently.

Was that a common Occurrence?
It was a very frequent Occurrence,

Have you found that Prayers ever occurred in those Schools within your own Knowledge and Observation, during the Times that were not Times of separate Religious Instruction?
I have never actually found in any School that I visited under the Board the Scholars at Prayer; therefore as far as relates to the Word Prayer I cannot say that I have found any Deviation from the Rules of the Board; but I am aware that the teaching of the Roman Catholic Catechism goes forward in the greater Part of the Schools of the Board in the Roman Catholic Parts of the Country, both before and after the School Hours, independently of my having met with repeated Instances of the Use of this Catechism at the Time for combined Instruction. I know myself, from my Knowledge of the Hedge

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Schools, or common Schools of Ireland, that the Use of the Roman Catholic Catechism is general in almost all of them; and I believe that the Appointment of the Schoolmaster in a great degree depends upon his teaching this Catechism; and I think he would not be appointed if he did not undertake to do it. It is a Practice mixed up with the old Plan of Education in the common Hedge Schools of the Country. Therefore I am not much surprised that in the Schools of the Board under the Management of the Roman Catholic Clergy the Roman Catholic Catechism should be extensively taught both before the Time of combined Instruction and very frequently in it.

Did you find that the Rule of the Board in respect of having One Day set apart for separate Religious Instruction was in most Cases strictly observed?

Quite the reverse.

You found that in most Cases that Rule was set at nought?

Yes; I never visited Schools under the Board upon the Days set apart for Religious Instruction in which I found Religious Instruction going on, unless, as well as I recollect, in Two or Three Instances.

How did you know, when you went into the Schools, that it was the Day set apart for Religious Instruction?

I should not have so understood it unless I had seen it in the Rules of the School exhibited in the Schoolroom, and from the Statements of the Teacher that the Day upon which I happened to see the School was the Day, pro formâ, set apart for Religious Instruction.

Did you ever remonstrate with the Teacher upon that Violation of the Rules of the Board?

The Fact is, ever since I have been Inspector of Schools I have felt a considerable Degree of Delicacy in interfering with the Arrangements in any School that I have visited, and particularly in Ireland. I doubt very much whether it would be exactly expedient for me to go into a School and censure the Master for his Plans and Practices.

The Question was, whether you ever remonstrated with the Master for this Deviation from the Rules of the Board?

Being called upon suddenly to answer the Question, I do not happen to have the Documents at this Moment before me, and cannot answer to it.

You do not recollect ever to have remonstrated with the Schoolmaster?

I visited a School in the City of Dublin under the Board some Time ago; St. Michael and St. John's School; it happened to be the Day for Religious Instruction; I found Literary Instruction going forward; it was about Half past One o'Clock in the Day, and the Schoolmaster told me that it was the Day set apart for Religious Instruction, but that he thought it was too long to devote to it the entire Day, and that he did not do it; and in the Female School I noticed that the Inspector of the Board had entered a Protest against the whole of the Day not being set apart for Religious Instruction. I asked if the Day was set apart, or how did it happen; he said that an Explanation, he believed, had been made to the Secretary of the Board, but at all events such was their Practice.

Do you mean to say that on that Day when you visited the School you understood a Part of the Day to have been devoted to Religious Instruction, though not at that particular Part of the Day that you visited it?

As I understood the Master's Statement, it was this:—Prior to my Visit the whole of the Day had not been devoted to Religious Instruction; I am not aware whether he intended to devote the Remainder of the Day or not.

What Day of the Week was this?

It was Friday.

Were you rightly understood to say that the Master told you that he thought it was too long a Time to devote to Religious Instruction merely, and that therefore he was not in the habit of keeping to that Rule?

Yes, he did; and that there was a Communication made to the Board by a Roman Catholic Clergyman, or one of the Managers of the School.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Then in fact the Day not being set apart entirely for Religious Instruction, that you consider as being a decided Violation of the Rule?
Unquestionably I do.

Do you know what Proportion of Roman Catholic and of Protestant Children attended that School?
I do not believe that there was a Protestant at all.

Did you make an Entry in the Visitors Book of the improper Conduct of the Master?
No, I did not; I understood from the Schoolmaster that a Communication had been made to the Board upon the Subject.

Did you understand that he was authorized to conduct it upon that Plan?
I cannot say that.

Have you ever gone into the Mill Street School in Dublin?
I have.

In that School had you Occasion to observe that there was a similar Neglect of the Board's Rule as to setting apart a Day for separate Religious Instruction?
I do not recollect it in the Case of the Mill Street School, but I have a very distinct Recollection of it in the Richmond Street School, which is taught by Monks.

That appears to be a very large School?
It is.

731 Children appear to be upon the Rolls, according to the Return of the Board. Were there nearly as many as that when you were there?
I did not take a Note of the Number in attendance.

Did you examine the Mill Street School?
I heard a Class read, and was very much pleased with the reading. I was very much pleased also with the Order and Discipline and Cleanliness of the Scholars.

Did you question them at all?
Yes, I did.

Were you satisfied with their Answers?
They read a Lesson to me, in the Presence of One of the Monks, in the Reading Book published by the Board, and I thought the answering of the Boys extremely intelligent.

Did you examine the Boys in the Richmond Street School?
No, I did not.

In the Richmond Street School did any thing come to your Knowledge respecting the relative Proportions of the Children of the Two Churches?
There were not more than Two or Three Protestants in the whole of the Richmond Street School, according to the Statements made to me by the Monks.

Is there in the Richmond Street School a Board put up "Model School" as well as "National School"?
Yes; Two Inscriptions.

And this School is taught by Monks?
Yes.

Did you ask any Question in the School why that was put up?
I understood that it was a Model School for the training of Schoolmasters prior to the Establishment of the National Board in Ireland; and I suppose that Inscription was then placed over it, and it has not been since changed.

This is in Dublin, under the Eyes of the Inspectors, who may go there, and under the Eyes of any Members of the Board who may go there?
Unquestionably.

Then

627

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Then this, which is glaringly under the Eyes of all Persons in Dublin, continues still to be announced both as a National School and as a Model School?

It is announced as a National School from being upon the List of the National Board, and it still retains its Name of a Model School.

Is or is not the Inscription "National School" also upon the Board?

Both Inscriptions were exhibited outside.

Under what System was it a Model School?

It was a School established several Years ago, I rather think, in opposition to the Kildare Place Model Schools. It was assisted, as I learn, by the Roman Catholic Association to a large Extent. Mr. O'Connell, if I recollect right, at the Head of a very large Procession, laid the first Stone of it. It was a Building got up at the Time that there was a good deal of Excitement on the Subject of Education in Ireland. It has been latterly placed under the Board, and receives Salaries from the Board.

Did you observe any thing objectionable in the School?

The only Irregularity or Departure from the Rules of the Board that appeared to me was this, that the Day set forth as being the Day for Religious Instruction was not observed as such. A Gentleman of high Respectability accompanied me to see that School; he is a Nephew of the late Earl of Longford; Mr. Thomas Stewart. He was present when I interrogated the Monk as to the usual Routine pursued in the School; and he stated to me that they did not appropriate the whole of the Day; and the Reason he assigned for it was this, that it would be quite too much for the Purpose. He said, "The Scholars would tire, and would not come if we did it, and therefore we do not."

Did you look into the Report Book of that School?

No, I did not look at any of the Accounts. I saw Two of the Schoolrooms, but I do not pretend to say any thing about the Proficiency of the Children.

Did you make any Inquiry as to the Use of the Scripture Lessons?

I did; and the Answer of the Monk was, that they did not use the Scripture Lessons.

You said there was not a single Protestant Boy in it?

Not more than Two or Three.

In a School in the Hands of Monks it is not likely that there would be many Protestant Children?

No.

Then you consider that where there are Schools under Monks the Protestants would of course keep away their Children?

I think it is very natural.

Do you happen to know whether that School is under the Patronage of Dr. Murray?

I understood that it was.

Who told you so?

I think it must have been the Monk, or I must have seen it in some Statement that it was under Dr. Murray. It was returned so by the Board to Parliament in August 1832; but the Impression upon my Mind generally is, that Dr. Murray is the Patron or Director of all those Monks Schools in Dublin, as Roman Catholic Archbishop.

You understand that Dr. Murray is the Superintendent or Director of all the Schools under Monks in the City of Dublin?

I think so. The Way in which this Committee can be satisfied about the Fact is this, that in the Dublin or Roman Catholic Almanack or Directory there is a List of those Schools and of the Officers belonging to them, and Dr. Murray's Name will be found amongst them, perhaps, if he be so.

Do you know the National School called the St. Thomas's School?

I do.

Is that under Monks?

No.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Do you happen to know whether that School has any Protestant Children in it?

I rather think it has not. There is an extremely well-conducted Protestant Female School in the immediate Neighbourhood of it, under the Dowager Viscountess Harberton; one of the best Schools in Ireland; and the Children are so well educated in it that I should think there will be very little Probability of their preferring the St. Thomas's Female School or any other.

Is the St. Thomas's School under Nuns?

No; there were Two Female Teachers over it when I visited, and one of those Teachers told me that she had been trained in the Nunnery School at Gardiner Street in the City of Dublin, but there were no Nuns teaching in it when I visited.

Is Lady Harberton's School connected with the National Board?

No; it is quite a private Institution.

How did you find the St. Thomas's Female School?

It appeared to me to be conducted with Regularity, as far as I could judge.

Did you find that any separate Day for Religious Instruction was kept?

I have made Notes of all those Schools, but I have not them with me at this Moment; I can very readily supply this Information afterwards. Friday is said to be set apart for the Purpose.

Generally speaking, as to the Schools of the National Board in Dublin, is the Impression upon your Mind that they are kept regularly or irregularly in relation to the Rules of the Board?

I should not be inclined to think that they were regularly kept. I have stated Two Instances of a Violation of the Rules of the Board in what appears to me, as I understand them, an essential Feature in those Schools; that is, setting apart a Day altogether for Religious Instruction; and in those Two prominent Cases the Rule was not observed; the one is the Monks School in Richmond Street, and the other is the St. Michael and St. John's School.

Are those the only Instances of Irregularity that you met with in the Schools in Dublin?

I did not visit them all, and therefore I cannot say. I visited the St. James's Female School which is under the Board, and in that School the Scripture Extracts are not used at all; they are there certainly, and the Schoolmistress showed them to me in the School Press. I asked her if they were read, and she said not. I asked her the Reason, and she said that the Roman Catholic Clergyman would not suffer them to be used at that Period.

Were all the Children there Roman Catholics?

I believe they were, but I am not quite sure; probably about the Time that I visited it they may have been all Roman Catholics, but some few Protestants were, I was told, in the habit of going to it; and the Schoolmistress stated that she had Prayers taught in the Morning and in the Evening; and she added, (because the Circumstance seemed to be rather remarkable,) that when the Protestants remained in the School, and Prayers were going on in it, they employed themselves in reading a Book or something else. I would have much preferred, as a Protestant myself, that they had not been permitted to remain in it at all.

When was this?

It was on the 22d of December.

Did you make any Entry in the Visitors Book?

I did not.

Why did not you?

I have not been in the habit generally of making Entries in any of the Books.

Why not?

I did not conceive that I was called upon to do it. I have been in the habit

629

Mr. Lewis Mills.

of visiting Schools of every Description; the Board of Erasmus Smyth's Schools, the Hibernian Schools, and the Schools of the Association; and I have not, where I have examined them, and found any thing I thought wrong, taken the Liberty of entering Protests in the Books; occasionally I have offered Suggestions.

Did you mention to anybody connected with the Management of these Schools that you had found those Irregularities?

I have not the Honour to know any of the Commissioners of the Board but Mr. Carlile, and even he but slightly; and it so happened that I have not met with him until I had the Pleasure of seeing him To-day in the Anteroom, since the Establishment of the Board. If I had had the Pleasure of meeting any of the Commissioners I should frankly and candidly have told them every thing I knew respecting these Schools, had they made Inquiry.

But you did not think it worth while to go out of your Way to inform them of those Irregularities?

I did not consider that to be exactly my Place.

At what Period did you visit the Mill Street School?

In the Month of October 1836.

About the same Time?

I visited the St. Michael and St. John's School, I think, twice.

At what Period?

Without immediate Reference to my Notes I would not like to say.

Can you tell whether it was about the same Period?

Perhaps it might be rather later.

And the Richmond Street; when did you visit that?

I visited the Richmond Street School twice also; the last Time in January 1837.

About the same Period?

I think it was in January; the 20th January 1837.

Was it with any particular View that at that particular Period you visited those Schools?

Within the last Three or Four Years I have been very anxious to get Information respecting the general State of Education in Ireland. It is a Subject that is engrossing a great deal of Public Attention, and I should be glad to understand it as much as possible.

Do you reside in Dublin?

I do.

With that Anxiety upon your own Mind for the last Three or Four Years, how happened it that just at this particular Period you set about visiting these Schools more than at any other Period?

I have not more at this particular Period than at others, when I could spare Time.

You were understood to say that about the Month of December you were there?

I stated that in the Month of December I happened to visit those Schools; but I did not mean to say that in December or in November, or in any One particular Month, I was more particularly desirous of visiting them.

You were asked whether you had any particular Object in visiting those Schools at that particular Period?

Nothing whatever, except to get Information respecting the State of Education.

Information which for Three or Four Years you had been desirous to get?

Just so.

And Information which in the last Three or Four Years you were in the habit, wherever you chanced to be, of seeking to acquire?

The Truth of the Matter is, I believe it has been my Practice, in travelling

Mr. Lewis Mills.

along the Country, to pass no School for the Education of the Poor without going into it.

The Question related, not to the Schools that you pass in travelling, but to the Schools in Dublin where you are continually residing?

Yes.

Is your habitual Residence in Dublin broken by the Duties of your Office which call you into other Parts of the Kingdom?

It is.

Is the Month of December one of the Months that you are ordinarily in Dublin, not occupied with the Inspection of Schools?

It is.

What Quantity of Time do you ordinarily employ in your Inspection as an Officer of the Kildare Place Society?

I suppose about Nine to Ten Months. When the Society received the Parliamentary Grant I have been frequently out for Ten Months; but latterly, as the Society's Funds have not been so considerable, I have not been out upon Inspection for so long a Time in One Year.

You have said that you did not inform the Commissioners of those Irregularities; did you report them to anybody else?

No; not officially to a Public Body.

Did you mention them to nobody?

I was applied to for Information from a highly respectable Quarter respecting the Condition of the Schools of the Board, and some Schools of particular Importance were pointed out to me, with a Request that I would see what Kind of Schools they were; in conformity with that Request I visited them.

Who made that Request to you?

It was made to me by a Member of the House of Lords.

Was the Bishop of Exeter one of the Persons who made that Request?

Yes.

Did any other Person apply to you for Information respecting the Schools?

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.

Was it in consequence of that Request that you made those Visits?

Those Two or Three Schools I did visit in consequence of that Request.

Did you not report the Result of your Visit to those Gentlemen at whose Request you made the Visit?

I gave an Outline of the State in which I found them, as to the Number of Children and the Books used; but it was more in relation, as well as I recollect, to the Circumstance of Grants being made. There were large Grants made by the Board to One or Two Schools.

What was more in relation to those Grants; do you mean to say that the Inquiry was more in relation to those Grants?

There was One School, the King's Inn Street School, to which there was a very large Building Grant made; there were a great Number of Children returned as Children to be educated at it, and I was asked what Kind of a School this was, and what was the Plan of it, and so on; and I had that in my Mind when I spoke about the Grants.

Who made that Request to you?

The Bishop of Exeter.

Did not the Bishop of Exeter ask you such Questions as might seem likely to occur to an Individual who wanted Information respecting the State of the National Schools?

Just so; and I should have given Information to any Noble Lord who applied to me for it upon the Subject.

Did you or did you not understand that the Bishop of Exeter made no Secret of making Inquiries in as many Quarters as he possibly could with the Hope of Success?

Certainly.

You have been a long while in the Employment of the Kildare Place Society?

I have.

Are

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Are you still in their Employment?
I am.

You say that your Employment has been considerably diminished since their Funds have been diminished?
I mean that my travelling has not been just as great as it formerly was.

Has your Income consequently been diminished?
No; I cannot say that my Income has been much diminished. It is certainly not now diminished, because I have the Honour to hold an Office under another Board.

Have you any pecuniary Interest whatever opposed to the Prosperity of this National Board?
Not the slightest on the Face of the Earth, and not the slightest Antipathy or Dislike, or Ill-feeling to any one whatever connected with it.

But it is naturally to be supposed that you are better inclined towards the Society of which you were a paid Officer before?
Certainly; and for this Reason, because I have had ample Opportunities of contrasting the Merits and Demerits of the Two Systems together. That is the Reason, and the only Reason.

Did you ever hear any particular Complaints made of Misrepresentation as to the Schools and Scholars under the Kildare Place Society?
I have. I have a good many Years ago a distinct Recollection of a Complaint made by Lord Cloncurry.

Will you state what it was, as far as you can recollect?
I recollect a Correspondence that took place between Lord Cloncurry and the Kildare Place Society a good many Years ago; and in his Correspondence I recollect Lord Cloncurry stated, that he understood that the reading of the Scriptures was conducted in such a Manner as that the Schoolmaster read to the Scholars a few Verses, and that that was interpreted as a Compliance with the Rules of the Society. I am now quoting without the Documents, but I can readily supply them.

You heard that Lord Cloncurry objected to the System of the Schoolmasters reading a few Verses of the Testament or of the Bible to the Scholars in the School?
No; but I understood that Lord Cloncurry stated or alleged that the Rules of the Society were acted upon in this fraudulent Manner, and that the Society believed or represented that the Rules were observed. I have only to say, that after an Experience of Eighteen Years of practical Intercourse with the Schools through every Part of Ireland, I have not the slightest Idea that such is the State of the Case.

Are you certain that the Compliance with the Rule of the Board was not by the Master reading either in the Absence of the Scholars, or reading a Portion of the Scriptures himself, selected by him, and not generally through the Sacred Volume?
If he read them when there were no Scholars in the School that would of course be no reading at all for School Purposes.

Did you never hear of that being done?
I never did; and whoever could do it, in order to comply with the Rules, must have been guilty of a flagrant Piece of Dishonesty. But Lord Cloncurry, being a Life Member of the Kildare Place Society, and presumed to be acquainted with all our Modes of Proceeding, and all our Rules and Conditions, must be aware that distinct Pledges in answer to Queries are given, that the Scriptures without Note or Comment should be read by every Scholar in the School who should have attained a suitable Proficiency in reading; and that that must be done before any Aid or Assistance was given by the Society.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.

Die Martis, 9° Maii 1837.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Mr. LEWIS MILLS is called in, and further examined as follows:

You Yesterday spoke of the Richmond Street School in Dublin as having put upon its Walls Two Inscriptions, "Model School" and "National School;" you were understood to say that you did not understand what was the Meaning of those Inscriptions?
The Words "National School" are an Inscription put over every School of the Board, by Order of the National Board; the Words "Model School" I suppose were put up at the Time the School was first established by the Monks.

How is that put up?
I think it is upon a Board, fastened upon the Outside.

Is it a Stone let into the Wall?
I think it is not a Stone; I think it is a Board.

It is something put up permanently there?
I think from the Appearance of it it has remained there a long Time.

It is put up in a Manner similar to the Inscription "National School"?
I think there is no Difference between the Two.

How is that put up?
I think they are both Boards

Are they hung up, or are they inserted in the Wall?
As well as I recollect, they appear to be hung up.

Do you happen to know whether Mr. Edmund Rice resides at that Place?
He resides in a very large Building quite close to the School.

Is that the Mr. Edmund Rice who commenced a Religious Society in Waterford many Years ago, called the Religious Brothers of the Christian Schools?
I understand that he is; One of the Monks in Richmond Street School told me so. They told me that Mr. Rice, the Founder or Superintendent of that Order of Monks or Teachers, or whatever they may be, resided in the adjoining Premises.

Here is what appears to be a complete Catholic Registry, Directory, and Almanack for the Year 1836, printed for the Proprietor by John O'Sullivan, and sold by all the Catholic Booksellers. It says, "The Religious Brothers of the Christian Schools," of which it gives a long Description; and then it goes to say, "Mr. E. J. Rice is Superior of this Society, and resides with his Two Assistants, Mr. I. F. Thornton and Mr. E. A. Dunphy, at the Model Schools, North Richmond Street, Dublin. In this Establishment the Novices are trained for the other Houses of the Society." Is that the Model School of which you have been speaking?
I am sure it is.

The following is stated to be a List of the Schools attached to the above Houses, with the Number of Children in daily Attendance; will you state whether this is an accurate Description of the Schools which you saw in North Richmond Street with the Titles of "National School" and "Model School" over it: "Dublin, North Richmond Street, Mr. I. F. Thornton, Di-

Mr. Lewis Mills.

rector; Number of Schools, Four; Number of Children daily educated, Six hundred"?

I should think it is.

It says the Number of Schools, Four; how do you suppose that is to be accounted for?

There is a very large Attendance of Scholars in the School, and the School-house is divided, as well as I recollect, into Four Apartments; and there is a Teacher over each of the Schools.

When you talk of the Richmond Street School you include all those Four Schools?

I do, because I look upon them as all under One Establishment.

It being stated in the Appendix to the Second Report of the National Board, that in the Parish of Saint George's, Richmond Street, County of Dublin, there is a School having 731 Children, with Six Male Teachers, at a Salary of 60*l.*, do you understand that to be the School of which you have been speaking?

I do.

Now with respect to the King's Inn Street School in Dublin; is that in the Parish of St. Mary's?

It is.

The Third Report of the Commissioners states, "King's Inns Street School, Saint Mary's, Total of the expected Attendance of Children, 1,000; Aid granted by the Commissioners toward building, 533*l.*; Amount of local Contribution toward building and fitting-up, 387*l.*" You know that School?

I have visited it.

Is it near any School which was in existence before?

It is next Door to the Scriptural Protestant Day Schools of Saint Mary's Parish.

Then this is a recently-built School?

It is.

How long have you known of its Existence?

I visited the King's Inns Street School the first Time in March 1836; I visited it a second Time in December 1836.

How long ago was the first Visit you made?

The first Time I visited it was on Saturday the 12th of March 1836.

You say it is built next Door to the Scriptural Protestant Day Schools; were those Scriptural Day Schools efficient Schools in Dublin?

Very much so.

Did many Children of both Roman Catholics and Protestants attend?

There were a considerable Number of Roman Catholics and Protestants attending them, but I think the Attendance of Roman Catholic Scholars was very much lessened, particularly in the Female and Infant Schools, by the opening the King's Inns Street School under the Board.

Of what Class of Children does the Attendance consist?

I suppose of Roman Catholics, in the National School.

You do not know?

I have no Doubt of it.

Are there many poor Children in the Parish of Saint Mary, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic?

I think there are.

It appearing by the Return of the Commissioners of Public Instruction that there are 6,065 Protestant Children, and 17,071 Roman Catholic Children, have you any Doubt that there must be a great Number of poor Children of both Persuasions in that Parish?

I have no Doubt of it.

Will you look at Page 109 b. of the Second Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction; do you see this School there described?
It is called the Parochial Daily School in King's Inn Street.

Is that the School of which you are speaking?
I think it must be, though I should not have been previously disposed to give it the Name of Parochial, because I should be afraid to confound it with the other Parochial School for Interns in the Parish.

Will you state whether there appears to be any Indication of any other Aid than Instruction being given?
No, there is not.

What is the Number of Children that attend that School?
There are 111 Males and Fifty Females returned here; in all 161.

When did you first visit this King's Inn Street School?
On Saturday the 12th of March 1836 I visited the National School of King's Inn Street.

At what Hour were you there?
I made a Note at the Time; at about Twenty Minutes past Eleven o'Clock.

Were you told by the Teacher that Saturday was set apart for Religious Instruction or not?
I was.

Was that Teacher a Nun?
No.

Were the Rules suspended in the School?
I cannot say; I made no Note of it upon that Occasion.

How were the Children employed?
At common Literary Education.

Though it was a Day set apart for Religious Instruction?
Yes.

What were they reading or writing?
Some of the Scholars were writing on Slates, and other Classes were engaged in spelling and reading on the tabular Lessons.

What are the tabular Lessons?
They are spelling and reading Lessons in large Characters, most generally pasted on Boards, and suspended around the Schoolroom, for the Purpose of teaching the Children Spelling and Reading.

What practical Effect do you conceive is likely to arise from Literary Instruction being given on a Day that is set apart for separate Religious Instruction?
In any mixed Community it involves the Danger of inducing Children of different Denominations to come to the School for Literary Instruction; and then, as in the Case of that School, so much a Roman Catholic School, and under Roman Catholic Management and Direction, the great Probability is that the Roman Catholic Catechism would be taught in it, and that only.

Were there any other Children besides Roman Catholic Children?
The Schoolmistress said that there were some Protestant Children belonging to the School, but I cannot say whether they were there that Day or not.

Do you know how many?
I cannot say.

The Schools are spoken of in the Plural; what are they?
There are the Infant School and Two Female Schools; they appear to be conducted with a good deal of Order, and the Scholars were very neat and clean; I saw no Objection to the Routine observed in the School but that with regard to the Scholars being at Literary Instruction on that Day.

The Schools are stated here to be calculated to contain 1,000 Children; would you think they were capacious enough for that Number?
I should be unwilling to hazard an Opinion upon the Subject.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Were they very numerous when you were there?
The Schools were not quite full; but Saturday is not a Day upon which there are so many as usual in any daily School.

Were the Books which you saw in use and the tabular Lessons those of the Board?
No; I have noted here that the Tablet Lessons of the "Catholic Book Society" are used.

What Society is that?
I cannot take upon me to describe it to your Lordships; it is an Institution in Dublin, and Books are compiled and sold by it.

Under whose Direction is it?
I cannot say, but I presume it to be under the Direction of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

Did you make any Communication to the Commissioners upon the Subject of what you saw
I did not.

Had you any Reason to suppose that they would be unwilling to receive from you a Communication of a Violation of their Rules?
I do not know any of the Commissioners unless Mr. Carlile, and I have not been in the habit of making Communications to any Individuals or public Bodies respecting the State of the Schools of the Country that I have no official Connexion with.

But you appear to have taken Notes very extensively?
I have been always in the habit of doing so.

And you have never thought it worth while to make any Communication upon the Subject?
If I had been interrogated by any Commissioner of the Board I should have done so.

To whom did you first communicate these Notes?
To the Bishop of Exeter.

When?
I think it was immediately subsequent to this Visit.

When was the Visit made?
On the Twelfth of March 1836.

But you did not communicate them to the Commissioners, who might have immediately remedied any Abuse you might have found there?
I did not.

Why did not you?
It was not my Practice.

Do not you consider it the Duty of every Man, if he sees what he considers to be a glaring Abuse, to communicate that Fact to those that have the Power of remedying it?
I did not know in what Light it might be regarded; whether it might be looked upon as an Interference to do so. I have a good deal of Occupation, and if I were to sit down after visiting the Schools of the Board to make Reports upon each Case to the Commissioners it would take more Time than I could spare to such a Purpose.

Do you know any of the Inspectors of the Board?
I do not know any except One, who was an Inspector of the Kildare Place Society.

Did you make any Communication to him?
No.

What is his Name?
Mr. Skelton.

Did

Did you feel any Wish to have this remedied?
I certainly would like to see every Thing erroneous in any School removed from it, though I did not feel myself called upon personally to go to the Board and complain respecting the School. I visited it in consequence of a Request having been made to me from a very high Authority, one which I have felt every Disposition to give Satisfaction to, and I engaged myself in endeavouring to remedy what I considered to be Grievances in the State of Irish Education.

Is the high Authority you refer to the Bishop of Exeter?
Yes.

Did you make any Remark in the Visitors Book?
Not upon that Occasion.

Did you conceive that the Communication made by you to the high Authority of whom you have spoken tended to remedy the Evil?
Undoubtedly it was with that Impression I made it.

Did you think it was more likely to be remedied by making a Representation to the Bishop of Exeter than if you had represented it to the Board itself?
I did think that if I represented it to the Bishop of Exeter it would have a better Chance.

By what Process?
The School is a School under the Patronage of Dr. Murray, and I thought that he would be very naturally anxious not to have the School interfered with; I thought also that, considering the State in which Irish Education is placed, that if it were taken up as it is now, by a Committee of this House, in all Probability whatever were Grievances in it, or whatever was wrong in it, would be rectified.

Did you mean to say that you thought the most likely Way to have those Abuses remedied was by their being taken up by a Committee in this House?
I did.

Did you know that there was to be a Committee of this House upon the Subject?
I did not then, but I expected an Inquiry would be ultimately made, and could not be avoided.

Then why was that a Reason for your not communicating to the Commissioners, who would have had the Power of remedying the Abuses at once?
I thought that the Commissioners were very much attached to their System and their own Rules and Regulations, and perhaps might regard my Interference as uncalled for.

Was that your Reason for not informing them that their Rules and Regulations were not complied with?
I do not mean to say perhaps that it might have been a sufficient Reason.

Was it your Reason?
It was certainly one of my Reasons.

Then one of your Reasons for not informing the Commissioners that their Rules and Regulations were not complied with was that you knew them to be very anxious that their Rules and Regulations should be complied with?
I thought so from the Nature of their Reports.

Then one of the Reasons why you did not inform them that their Rules and Regulations were not complied with was that you thought they were very anxious that their Rules and Regulations should be complied with?
That puts the Matter in such a Shape that I cannot comprehend it.

Then what was the Reason that you did not inform the Commissioners that their Rules and Regulations were not complied with?
I said Yesterday, and I say again, that I have not been in the habit of making Communications to the Societies at the Head of the different Schools for the

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Poor which I have been in the habit of visiting. That is my Answer to the Question; and I have been led to make Answers now which I do not at the present Moment understand, they have been mixed up so much together.

Was it not in point of fact the Case that you went to those Schools for the Purpose of discovering Flaws in the Management of them, and without any Anxiety to have those Flaws corrected?

Indeed it was not. I should be exceedingly sorry to be thought capable of doing such a Thing as to go to a School for the sole Purpose of finding Fault. Those Points in that School that I look upon to be useful and good I have already stated, but I wished to convey exactly the State of each School that I visited.

Did you not go solely and entirely in consequence of the Request of the Bishop of Exeter?

I did.

Did the Bishop of Exeter direct you or request you to make Reports to him solely of the Things which were blameable in the Schools you visited?

He did not.

Was the Tone of his Communication to you such as would lead you to suppose that he wished you to make to him other than full and fair Representations of the State of every National School that you saw?

It was perfectly the reverse of a Wish to suppress Facts.

Did you feel any Delicacy in your Position as Inspector of the Kildare Place Society in making adverse Reports of the State of any Schools whatever, National or others?

I did; and I believe that it is the Practice with all Inspectors of Schools in Ireland that I am acquainted with, who may happen to visit Schools not belonging to the Institutions they are connected with, not to make Reports of them to the Parent Societies.

Then in this Instance you did not forbear from doing that which you were in the Custom of doing at other Times?

Certainly not.

Were you rightly understood to say that you found that Dr. Murray was the Patron of this School?

The Schoolmistress informed me that Dr. Murray was the Patron of it.

Did you, when you visited that School upon the Occasion you have spoken of, see the Rules and Regulations of the Board hung up in the Room?

What may be called the Rules, as I understand them, and as I used the Expression "Rules," is a Paper drawn up by the Board, specifying the Occupation of the different Classes in the School at stated Hours. Those I believe are directed by the Board to be exhibited in the Schools. Upon the first Visit that I paid to the School I did not see them in it. I see there is no Note upon the Subject in the Memoranda of my Visit.

You are not prepared to say positively that they were not there?

I have no Note upon the Subject at this Visit.

You say you went to visit the School at the Request of the Bishop of Exeter, and you therefore found out the State in which the School was?

As well as I recollect the Purport of the Bishop of Exeter's Letter it was this, that a large Money Grant was made by the Board to that School; that it was competent to contain a considerable Number of Children, and he requested me to see it. I went to see it, and did not at all conceive, when I went, that the School was actually in operation, because I conceived, from the Nature of the Bishop's Letter, that it was merely a "Building" Case. I found it in operation, however, and went into it. The Schoolmistress told me it was the Day set apart for Religious Instruction. I was about to withdraw, seeing that such was the Case, and I apologized to her for going in, seeing that it was the Day for Religious Instruction. She said it was of no Consequence; that I might go in if I pleased. I did so, and found the Children employed at Literary Instruction.

Did she know for what Purpose you went to the School?
I do not know.

Did you tell her who you were?
I did not.

She did not make the least Objection to let you see the School?
No.

Did you ever write to the Bishop of Exeter to say that the Schoolmistress was a Nun?
I did not, for I did not think she was One.

Had you any Reason to believe that she was a Nun?
No.

You said that there is no Memorandum in your Note Book respecting the Rules and Regulations being hung up in that School?
Not appertaining to that Visit.

Do you believe therefore that the Rules and Regulations were there?
I can say nothing upon that Subject.

When you went to that School to see how it was going on, and to find out any Abuses, would you not, if you had found out any Abuse, have made a Memorandum in your Note Book?
I did not go especially to look for Abuse; I was not instructed to look for Abuse. I went to see what Kind of School it was.

Then did not you think it a Matter of Importance that the Rules and Regulations should be put up?
Certainly.

If they had not been put up would not there have been some Entry in your Note Book of that?
It so happened that I did not take any Note about it.

Did you see any Protestant Children there?
I did not; the Mistress told me upon that Occasion that a few Protestant Children attended.

Did she say that there were any there on that Day?
She did not.

You do not know there was a single Protestant Child there upon that Day?
I do not, and I do not know that I asked her the Question.

How many Children were there in the School?
I did not count the Number.

Were there 100?
I could not say.

You say there are Three Schools under the same Roof?
Yes.

Which was the largest; the Infant School or the other Two?
I do not recollect at this Moment; the Three Schools seemed to be tolerably full, but I should think not so full as they are on the other Days of the Week, for the Attendance at all Schools on the Saturday is small.

Did you examine any of the Children?
I did not regularly examine them; I walked along the Classes engaged in the Spelling and Reading Lessons, and I looked at some of the Writing on Slates; but in no Schools under Institutions that I am not in official Connexion with have I taken the Liberty of regularly examining the Scholars.

Did you see the Scripture Extracts there?
I did not see them, but the Teacher said that they were used in the School.

You were not requested by the Schoolmistress to put any Observations in the Visitors Book, were you?
Not upon that Occasion.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Did you see any Book prepared for that Purpose?
I did not; I did not ask any Question about it.

Have you any Note of what you reported to the Bishop of Exeter respecting the School?
I have not; except the Substance of the Notes that I have here.

In that Report which you made did you report what might appear to you the Advantages of the System as well as its Defects?
I do not recollect the Particulars of the Report. I think it is likely that I stated to the Bishop that I saw the Scholars neat, clean, and orderly in the School; and that I mentioned having found Literary Instruction going on.

Your Report related rather to the School than to the National System?
It must have related to the particular School, and not to the National System generally.

You were understood to express a Desire that the Irregularities and Departures from the Directions of the Commissioners should be remedied in the Schools; were you rightly so understood?
I beg leave to make One Remark respecting the System of the Board generally. I do not think the System of the Board calculated to prove a combined System of Education for Ireland; I do not think it is suited to the Country at large.

Has that been your Opinion for some Time?
It has.

Was it your Opinion before you undertook these Inspections?
Yes.

Then you did not undertake them with any Wish in your Mind that the System should flourish?
Nor did I undertake them with a Wish that it should not succeed, either, in particular Places. I looked upon it, as soon as its Principles were announced, that such Principles were not suited to the Country. When I first saw the Prospectus of them as they appeared in the Newspaper the Conclusion upon my Mind was, knowing, as I had some Right to know, the State of Education amongst the poorer Classes of Ireland, that such a System would not do in the Country as a System for the whole of the Population.

Then the Supposition expressed in the last Question was right, that you did not wish the System to succeed?
I did not wish the System to be the only System in Ireland for the Education of the Poor.

But positively and abstractedly taken, without reference to any other Schools, you did not wish the System to succeed?
I can give no other Answer to that Question than the last Answer I gave to it, —that if it was designed as a System to supersede other Systems in the Country, and to take within its Sphere all the Schools in Ireland for the Protestants and Roman Catholics, I should have no Hesitation in saying at once that I would not wish it to succeed.

But whatever might have been the Intentions of the Persons with whom that System originated, the Question is with respect to your own Feeling; was not your own Feeling upon the Subject a Desire that that System should not succeed?
I do not see how I can answer that Question more pertinently than I have already done.

You were a long Time attached to the Kildare Place Society?
I was.

Do the Kildare Place School Society generally look upon these Schools as Rivals in some Sort of theirs?
They probably must have looked upon it as an opposition System in some respects; but in speaking of the Kildare Place Society it is right to say this: I never received any Instruction from the Kildare Place Society or from the Committee, to visit the Schools of the Board. Shortly after the Board was

established an Application was made, I understand, by Mr. Holmes, one of the Commissioners, for a Copy of the Instructions to our Inspectors, and it was given to the Board, so that the Society did not show an unfriendly Feeling. The Kildare Place Society felt themselves called upon, of course, to support their Schools as far and as long as they could conceive, and I think with every Right too, that their Plan was adapted to the Circumstances of Ireland.

Did you yourself personally consider this as an antagonist System?

I was obliged upon many Occasions to think hardly of its Effects. If your Lordships please I will give you a strong Instance of it. Shortly after the Board was established there was a School in connexion with the Kildare Place Society in Queen's County, at a Place called "Trummery;" it was upon the Property of Sir Charles Coote. The Kildare Place Society assisted in building the Schoolhouse. There was, I understand, a Promise of a Lease made by Sir Charles Coote to the Society; there was a Roman Catholic Master in the School; there were, I think, upwards of 100 Scholars in it; about Thirty of those Children were Protestant; the Scriptures were regularly read in the School, and the Protestant Curate of the Parish was the Patron of it. Shortly after the Board was set up the Priest of the Parish stated, as I was informed, that he had the Authority of Sir Charles Coote to place this School under the National Board; an Application was accordingly made to the Board upon the Representation of this Roman Catholic Clergyman; some Protestants, as I understand, were induced to affix their Signatures to the Application for Aid; but the Upshot of the Matter was, that the School was placed under the Board, notwithstanding its Connexion with the Kildare Place Society, and one of the Priests concerned took upon himself, and entered in the Report Book of the School that he did so, the Office of Local Patron. Now in that respect I do not know why I should not regard the System of the Board as being something of an antagonist System, when a School which we had assisted to establish under those peculiar Circumstances was wrested from us.

Then in point of fact you do so regard it as an antagonist System?

It is an antagonist System where it interferes with the Kildare Place Schools. I do not mean to speak disparagingly of the System in particular Parts of the Country; I say that in the Instance now adverted to I look upon it that it wrought Evil; it deprived a very meritorious and efficient Protestant Clergyman of that beneficial Control which he exercised over the lower Classes in his Neighbourhood in the Way of Education in a beneficial Manner.

How did it do that?

The Roman Catholic Clergyman became the Manager and Patron of the School, and the Board gave a Salary to the Master upon the Application made.

Did that prevent the Protestant Clergyman from going to the School?

I do not say that it would prevent him, but he would not be disposed to superintend as before.

After the Protestant Clergyman, without having been consulted, saw the School taken out of his Superintendence, and put under the Priest, could it be expected that he would visit the School?

I do not think it could; but I have also to say this: the Statement made respecting Sir Charles Coote's Consent to it was not founded on Fact, because I saw a Letter from Sir Charles addressed to the Curate of the Parish denying that he gave any such Consent to have the School given up to the Priest and taken from the Kildare Place Society.

In point of fact do you know that the Clergyman did not visit the School after it came under the National Board?

I think not.

Do you know the Fact?

In travelling through the Country I can of course have such Knowledge only as comes within my Reach at the Time. I do not know what has been done since. I know that the Clergyman who was concerned in the School is not now in that Neighbourhood, but the School is still in connexion with the Board, for upon a recent Occasion, on looking at the List of the Board's Schools, I saw it among the Number.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

You said that the Protestants were induced to sign the Application, to the Board; do you mean by "induced" that they were asked to sign, and did so?

Yes. My Understanding of the Case is this, that the Roman Catholic Clergyman stated to the Protestants of the Neighbourhood that Sir Charles Coote had given up that School to him, and they, conceiving that Sir Charles had done so, affixed their Signatures to the Document.

Do you know that Sir Charles Coote has not given up the School?

I saw his Letter to the Clergyman denying it.

Who has the School now?

The Board; the Priest being still, I believe, the local Manager.

Then Sir Charles has given it up?

Sir Charles was ready to perfect the Lease to the Kildare Place Society, and offered to do so, and was exceedingly annoyed, I understood, at what was done. My Authority for that is Captain Sandys, Sir Charles Coote's Agent; he told me that he was very much distressed at the Idea of his Name having been so made use of.

Did he tell you what Signs of Distress he showed?

He did not.

Did he tell you that he refused to give it to the Board?

I only know that Sir Charles Coote was willing to perfect the Lease to the Society, and I think the Papers were prepared; but in order to get possession of the School on the Part of the Society some legal Procedure was necessary, which the Society would have to enter upon, and which would involve them in Expense, and they had no Funds to meet such.

You were understood to say that the Kildare Place Society were in Possession?

They were.

Then how were they dispossessed?

The School was transferred to the Board, and consequently the fundamental Rules of the School were altered.

The Question is as to the legal Possession; the legal Possession of the School must have been transferred by Sir Charles Coote's Authority; was not that the Fact?

The School was under the Protestant Clergyman; the Priest made Application to the Board; he got a Salary from the Board; the Books of the Board of course were introduced; the System of the School was changed; the School is now a School of the Board, not one of the Kildare Place Society. I can pursue the Subject no further.

But could this have been done without Sir Charles Coote's Consent?

It appears to me to have been done without his Consent.

Has that new Lease been perfected since by Sir Charles Coote to the National Board?

I cannot say that. I think not.

Was it a prosperous School when it was under the Kildare Place Society?

Very much so; it was attended by about 100 Scholars in all, of whom Thirty or so were Protestants.

Have you any Reason to know, since it has been under the Board, whether the Protestant Children continue now to frequent that School?

I do not know. I know that the Reading of the Scriptures, which they were in the habit of attending to when it was a Kildare Place School, was disused after it came into connexion with the Board, for the Schoolmaster stated it to me.

Was the Schoolmaster a Protestant or a Roman Catholic when the School was under the Kildare Place Society?

A Roman Catholic.

Is the same Schoolmaster still in the School?

I think he is.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

You said it was taken from the Kildare Place Society, and you have spoken of a Lease; do you know that according to the Rule there would be no Lease granted by Sir Charles Coote to the Board unless the School had received Aid for building?

I do not know.

If the Rule be that Leases shall be required in those Cases, and in those Cases only, where the Board grants Assistance for building, the Fact in this Case being that no Aid according to this Return was granted for building, there would be no Lease granted?

I suppose not.

Look at this Return, and see whether it appears that any Aid for building has been granted? (*A Return being shown to the Witness.*)

I do not see any Building Grant entered here.

In whom now is the Building vested?

Legally, I should think, it is in the Kildare Place Society.

You stated that no Lease was made to the Kildare Place Society?

There was a Memorandum of a Lease given when the Society assisted to build the Schoolhouse, which Sir Charles Coote and his Agent recognized as so strongly obligatory upon them that they were ready, as well as I can now recollect, to perfect it, and they proposed to do so to the Society or the local Patron, in order to let them regain Possession.

How came it that they did not do it?

The Society had not Funds to enter into a Lawsuit.

Are you aware that there are Schools in the North of Ireland that were under the Kildare Place Society that are now under the National Board?

I am.

Is that also a Reason why you consider it in a certain Degree an antagonist System?

I know of some Schools established by the Board immediately adjoining Kildare Place Schools, almost alongside of them, and unquestionably it appears to me they looked very like antagonist Schools when they were so placed.

Do you happen to be acquainted with those Schools in the North of Ireland that were under the Kildare Place Society, and that are under the Board?

Yes.

Are you aware what has been the Result as to the Number of Children attending those Schools?

I am not.

Do you happen to have heard how many Schools there are so circumstanced?

As nearly as I could obtain Information from the Kildare Place Society, no less than 194 Schools in the North of Ireland, formerly Kildare Place Schools, have been placed under the Board.

Were they under your Inspection?

They were under the Society's Inspection.

They are no longer so?

They are no longer so.

And you do not inspect those Schools?

I do not officially inspect them. I am in the habit of visiting every Kind of School for the Poor that I meet with.

When you did inspect those Schools, were the Children in them Roman Catholics and Protestants?

They were.

Are any of them now attended by as many of the Two Classes as they were then?

I could not take upon me to answer that Question.

Do you know that some Protestants continue in them still?

I should think so.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Have you not heard that the Number of Children that attend them has increased since they changed the System?
I have not heard that; and I should be very much surprised if it were the Case.

Have you heard that they have diminished?
I have not, generally speaking.

Would that have surprised you?
It would rather have appeared to me the more likely Case.

Were you employed under the Kildare Place Society at the Time that the annual Grant was withdrawn from it?
I was.

And at that very same Time the present Government Plan of the National Board took its Rise?
It did.

Do you recollect the Grounds upon which the Grant was stated to be withdrawn from the Kildare Place Society, and the Grounds upon which this new National System was set in operation?
I do not distinctly recollect the Grounds.

Were not the Grounds partly these: that the Kildare Place Society did not fully answer the Purposes of joint Education, and that this System was established as one that it was hoped would answer those Purposes better?
I think those were the Grounds, as well as I recollect the Statement.

If those were the Grounds, can there be the least Doubt in your Mind that this was an essentially antagonist System to that of the Kildare Place Society?
Looking at it in that Light, I must regard it as an antagonist System.

Then it was intended by those that established it to replace that System from which at the same Time they withdrew the Grant of Public Money?
Yes.

Can you state to the Committee whether during the Time of the Existence of the Kildare Place Society as connected with the Government the Catholic Clergy visited those Schools, or withheld themselves from them?
At one Time there were a great many more Roman Catholic Clergy in connexion with the Society than subsequently. For instance, prior to the Education Commission of 1824 there were a considerable Number of Roman Catholic Clergy in correspondence with the Society, having Schools under their Care in connexion with it; after the Report of that Commission of 1824 a considerable Number of those Schools were withdrawn by the Roman Catholic Clergy from the Society; but down to the last Year that we received the Parliamentary Grant, and to this Day, Roman Catholic Children attended and do attend the Schools, and in some Instances Roman Catholic Clergymen visited them. The last Average Attendance reported by the Society, after an Inspection of all their Schools by their Inspectors, exceeded that of any former Year.

Can you state whether the Protestant Clergy have ever been in friendly Connexion with the National System?
I do not think, as a Body, that they have; some few have, but by no means the Number in proportion that there is in connexion with the Kildare Place Society. The last Average Attendance of Scholars in the School reported by the Kildare Place Society at the Time of the Parliamentary Grant was Eighty-four and a Half to each School, in the Year before that it was Eighty-one, the Year before that Eighty, and the Year before that Seventy-one; so that in point of fact the last Year that we had the Grant it was perfectly obvious that the System was more useful throughout every Part of the Country where the Schools existed than ever it had been before. Besides, in the last Year we had in connexion with us 1,621 Schools and 137,639 Scholars. We had at that Period trained 1,908 Schoolmasters and 482 Schoolmistresses, and at present the Society trains Teachers.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Do you mean to say that the Kildare Place Schools were progressively advancing at that Period up to the Time that the Grant was withdrawn?

Speaking of them as a Class, I do undoubtedly think so.

The Number of Schools was gradually increasing?

They were for several Years previously, with the Exception of One Year only, and the Schools increasing very much in Utility and Efficiency in every Department.

Was that Increase on the Number from Protestant Children only, or from Roman Catholic Children also?

I should think it was an Increase generally in all the Schools throughout the Country on the Books of the Society.

Do you know whether it was an Increase of Roman Catholic Children as well as of Protestant Children?

I have no Documents to speak from so as to satisfy your Lordships as to the Religion of the Scholars in 1831, because it is a Matter that we did not inquire into. When Inquiry was made in 1824 above One Half the Scholars were Roman Catholics. This was on sworn Returns made by the Clergy of all Denominations.

Do you know that there were several of the Kildare Place Schools which had been frequented by a considerable Number of Roman Catholic Children from which they had all or nearly all of them withdrawn some Time before the Institution of the National Board?

I do not recollect any such Circumstance. The Roman Catholic Clergy withdrew Schools after the Commission of 1824.

You do not take upon yourself to say that there were no Schools under those Circumstances from which the Roman Catholic Children had been entirely withdrawn?

I do not.

Have you ever visited the King's Inn Street School again?

I have.

When?

The last Time I visited it was on the 14th of December 1836.

What Day in the Week was it?

On a Wednesday.

Was that Day the Day set apart for separate Religious Instruction?

I was told so by a Nun who was teaching in the School.

Had the Teacher whom you had seen on the former Occasion in March been replaced by a Nun?

The School between the Time of my First and Second Visit had been placed under the Direction of Two Ladies belonging to the "Presentation Convent," as I understand; Two Nuns who were the chief Directors of it; they assisted in the teaching, and had the general Control.

And One of them told you that the Day of your Second Visit was the Day of separate Religious Instruction?

She did.

What were the Children doing then?

I found the Scholars in both Schools employed at the common Literary Business.

Were the Rules suspended in the School then?

They were not. I have made a Note here. I saw in none of the Schools the Rules posted up, though I asked for them; I asked the Teacher, upon leaving the School, why she had not the Rules posted up, and she either did not understand the Question, or could not give me any Account of it, for I know she did not give me any Information upon the Subject.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Would those Rules, if posted up, have exhibited a Statement that this Wednesday was the Day set apart for separate Religious Instruction?

They ought, if they were properly filled up.

Were you told whether any Protestant Children attended the School?

I asked the Question again; I had asked it before, and upon this Occasion I asked one of the Nuns if Protestant Children attended; she said that she could not exactly tell me; that she did not ask the Question as to who were Protestants and who were Roman Catholics.

Do you know the Rules of the Board well?

I do not profess to know them very well; I have seen them from Time to Time.

Among the Rules of the Board, No. 9, as to the Queries to be answered by Applicants, is as follows: "Will you take care that no Children be present at any Religious Instruction or Exercise except those whose Parents consent to their being present?" now in this School did you understand from the Nun that they did not take care that no Children were present at the Religious Instruction except those whose Parents consented to their being present?

The only Information touching that Subject that I can give is this: I asked the Lady if there were any Protestants in the School, and she said that she did not know exactly, for that she did not ask the Question.

While you were there did any thing occur specially that marked the peculiar Religious Persuasion of the Children who were there; was there any thing whatever that indicated that it was for the Service of Children of One Religious Persuasion?

Yes. I was walking along the Schoolroom, looking at the Classes that were spelling and reading on the Tablet Lessons, and One of the Nuns was with me; the Clock struck; there was a Pause in the Business of the School very apparent, and the Scholars appeared to repeat a short Prayer, and to make the Sign of the Cross.

This was at the Time when ordinary Literary Instruction was going on?

It was.

Were you told that this School in which this occurred was under the Patronage of Dr. Murray, One of the Commissioners?

I was. The Schoolmistress, when I visited it first on the 12th of March, told me that Dr. Murray was the Patron.

Was there a Report Book in this School?

There was. I saw no Religious Instruction going on in the Schoolrooms I entered. I went into Three Schools; the Infant School and the Two Female Schools; I went from the upper Room into the next Room, and as I was going out I saw one of the Nuns teaching a Class Catechism; however, as it was the Day set apart, as she stated to me, for Religious Instruction, of course it was a very legitimate Occupation. The Schoolmistress was anxious that I should make an Entry in the Report Book; I had no Objection to do so, and did make an Entry.

To what Effect was that Entry?

I noticed merely in it that I had experienced polite Attention on visiting the School, and that I thought the Scholars were neat, orderly, and clean.

Did you mention the Circumstance with regard to the sudden Stoppage of Business and making the Sign of the Cross?

I did not, because I understood when I went into the School in the first instance that it was the Day for separate Religious Instruction.

How did you know that it was not the Day for Religious Instruction?

By seeing the Literary Instruction going on.

Did it not strike you, then, that either there was an Irregularity in the Business going on, if it was the Day of Religious Instruction, or that there was an Irregularity in that Ceremony of making the Sign of the Cross if it was not the Day of Religious Instruction?

Unquestionably, the Irregularity plainly consisted in having the Literary Instruction

6147

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Instruction going on that Day at all; but I stated Yesterday that it appears to me to be the Opinion of all the Teachers in the Schools throughout the Country, as far as I can know, that the Appropriation of One whole and entire Day to Religious Instruction is a Thing that will not answer. The intelligent Monk in Richmond Street School, when I was speaking to him about it, stated that they really could not appropriate the whole Day to it; that the Children would not in all Likelihood attend if they did.

Were there any other Remarks made by any one else in the Book?
There was a Remark made in the Book by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, who had visited it a short Time before I visited it.

Did you observe in the Book any Notice of any Irregularity?
No; I noticed His Grace's Approval of the Order of the School, and its Appearance, as well as I recollect the Observation.

Was there any Notice of the Rules not being hung up?
There was not.

You were a long Time connected with the Kildare Place Society?
I was.

There was a Model School belonging to that Society?
There was.

Where is the Model School situated?
It is in Kildare Place.

How do the Scholars approach the Model School?
The Entrance to it is by Lacey's Lane for Boys, and the Entrance for the Female School is in the front Buildings in Kildare Place.

What Kind of Lane is Lacey's Lane?
It is a tolerably long Lane, leading out of Merrion Street.

What Sort of Persons generally inhabit it?
I do not know. I do not think I have ever passed through it more than Three or Four Times in the course of my Life.

Was not the Kildare Place Society highly approved of by the Gentry and the Proprietors in Ireland?
I think it received a very large Measure of their Support, and the best Proof in the World of that is to refer to the Twentieth Report of the Society, containing a List of the local Patrons when the Society had Parliamentary Assistance. I think any Person who sees the List of Patrons, Managers of Schools, which it contains, will be perfectly convinced of the large Support and Approval it met with from the Public, and from those competent to judge correctly.

What was the largest Sum ever subscribed in aid of your Society in any One Year?
I could not at this Instant take upon me to say that, but I can get Information by referring to the different Reports of the Society. The Society always wished local Patrons to apply their Funds to their own Schools when they were in possession of a Parliamentary Grant. This is a Return which was given in answer to an Order of Lord Francis Leveson Gower, the then Secretary of State for Ireland, and it applies to about 1,152 Schools. It is the aggregate Amount of Subscriptions and Donations received for the Support of the Society's Schools in each of the Years 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, and 1828, as far as the same could be ascertained. The Amount is this: local Contributions, 69,505*l.* 9*s.* 2$\frac{3}{4}$*d.*; the Payments of Scholars, 30,377*l.* 19*s.* 0$\frac{1}{4}$*d.*; the Total, 99,883*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.*; and the Amount granted from Parliament for those Years was only 59,441*l.* 19*s.* 7$\frac{1}{4}$*d.*, showing the local Aid to exceed the Parliamentary Aid to the very large Amount of 40,441*l.* 8*s.* 7$\frac{3}{4}$*d.* This Account extended to 1,152 Schools, the total Number from which Accounts could be obtained, and is exclusive of Land often given for the Use of the Teachers. In some Cases in the Country the People do not keep Accounts of their Expenditure on the Schools with that Regularity that they ought, and therefore the Society could not account for every School then on their Lists.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Do not there appear in the Report of the Kildare Place Society a great Number of anonymous Communications?

I have copied a good many of those Communications myself from the original Letters, and I can assure your Lordships that they are genuine.

The whole of them?

I have not copied the whole of them; but I have no Reason to doubt the Genuineness of them all, for I am sure that the Society was utterly incapable of publishing any thing spurious.

Did anybody make any Charge of that Description against the Society, of publishing anonymous Communications?

I recollect hearing it said that Mr. O'Connell at One Time stated that the Society published Letters from Places leaving out Names; and although the Society, I dare say, did not agree in the Propriety of his View, as constituting an Offence on their Part, yet they gave Names of the Parties afterwards; or I do not know if they did not suppress this Kind of Letter altogether. At all events, the Practice of publishing Letters does not exist now in the Reports.

You were Inspector in Queen's County?

I was.

Did you ever hear of a School called the Bellegrove School?

Yes.

Was there a Complaint made as to the Money drawn for it that you know of?

As I recollect the Circumstances, I am not aware of any Complaint having been made upon the Subject. The School was established by Mr. Adair; he built a very nice Schoolhouse; the School did not succeed to his Wishes.

Had you an Opportunity of knowing that Mr. Adair reported any particular Number of Scholars to be in that School?

The usual Case, as it is clearly explained in our own Reports, is, that when the Patron applies for Aid towards a School to the Society he fills up a certain Number of Queries; if the School was not in operation he was called upon to state the probable Number of Children that would attend it; the Society in making a Return of the School gave this Account of Numbers, having then no other Account to supply them.

You mentioned Yesterday that Lord Cloncurry had become a Subscriber to your Society?

Yes.

Can you state when?

It was in the very early Part of the History of the Institution.

Were there many other Peers of Ireland Subscribers at that Time to it?

I could not at this Moment say; many Peers have from Time to Time subscribed, but unless I refer to the Reports containing the Donations and Subscriptions I could not answer.

When did the Marquis of Downshire first become connected with the Society?

I cannot say without Reference to Documents; but we have had the Honour to have his Lordship's Patronage for a considerable Time, I am happy to say. He became President of the Society in 1823 or 1824.

Are you a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?

A Protestant.

Did you attend the great Protestant Meeting at the Mansion House on the Twenty-fourth of February?

I did; but I am not a Party Man of any Sort.

Do you know St. Peter's School in St. Paul's Parish on the North Circular Road?

I do

Did

Did you ever visit it?
I did.

When?
I visited it on the Fifteenth of December 1836.

How is it situated?
It is situated under the Roman Catholic Chapel on the North Circular Road.

Is it Part of the same Building?
It is.

Do you mean that it is the Basement Floor of the Building?
It is.

Do you know where the Teacher was trained?
The Master told me that he was trained at one of the Monks Schools in Dublin.

Did you understand that that was the Model School in Richmond Street?
He did not state what School it was.

Were the Rules of the School suspended there?
I have a Note that they were not posted up in the Male School, but that they were in the Female School.

Are you aware whether the School is now in connexion with the Board?
I do not know whether it is or not.

Is "National School" printed over it?
It was at the Date that I speak of.

Do you find it in the Appendix to the last Report of the Board?
I see the School here; St. Peter's Male and Female School, St. Paul's Parish; and I conclude it is the School in question.

Were there many Children there when you visited it?
I do not know the Number exactly present; but I looked at the Report Books in each School, and there appeared to be in round Numbers about 150 Boys and 150 Girls. I made no Note, however, of the exact Number.

Do you know whether they were Protestants or Roman Catholics?
I believe they were all Roman Catholic Children.

Did you visit the St. Andrew's School in the Parish of St. Peter's?
I visited the St. Andrew's Female School in Cuff Lane in the City of Dublin.

Is that in the Parish of St. Peter's?
It appears to be so in this Report.

Was it upon the Day of Religious Instruction that you visited it, or not?
I visited it on the 16th of December 1836; but I have not stated here the Day of the Week.

Did you know, from any Information given to you in the School, whether it was or was not the Day of Religious Instruction?
It must have been on the Day for Religious Instruction, because I made a Note here that I found the School at common Literary Instruction, which otherwise I would not have of course done.

On the other Occasions upon which you have deposed that you visited the Schools on the Day of Religious Instruction, do you draw that Inference from the Fact that you have entered on your Note that they were employed in Literary Instruction?
At those Schools the Teachers told me that it was the Day set apart for Religious Instruction; or if they did not it was entered in the Rules. With respect to my Visit to St. Andrew's School on that Day, I will read the Paragraph out of my Notes: "The Rules posted up say that Saturday is the Day devoted to Religious Instruction; but the Teacher and a Scholar told me that

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Friday was the Day usually devoted to it, and also on Saturday, but that few attended on the latter." On the Two Days Religious Instruction was communicated, as I understood her.

What Day was it that you went there?
I think it was on Friday that I visited this School; it was the 16th of December.

Did you ask whether any Protestant Children attended that School?
I did; and no Protestants attended.

Is that School returned by the Board as a School in the First Class?
This appears to be in the First Class of Applications.

Is that St. Andrew's School in St. Peter's Parish?
It is.

Are you aware whether that is the School for which the Reverend J. G. Robinson was stated to have been an Applicant?
I heard that it was for that School he applied.

Were you desired by the Bishop of Exeter to make Inquiries at this School respecting the Reverend Mr. Robinson?
I was.

Did you ask the Teacher, in consequence of that Request, whether she knew this Mr. Robinson?
I did; she said that she did not know or recollect the Reverend Mr. Robinson in connexion with the School.

Did she say how long she had been Teacher?
She told me that she had been about Four Years in the School.

And yet she never heard of this Mr. Robinson?
No.

Did you look into the Report Book to see whether the Reverend Mr. Robinson had ever left any Mark of his visiting the School?
I looked at the Report Book, and saw no Note of his having ever visited.

It having been stated in the Third Report to the Commissioners, that "Mr. Robinson, we understand, died about Two Years ago at his Residence in Queen Street;" did you, at the Request of the Bishop of Exeter, or otherwise, make any Inquiries of Persons in Queen Street, or near it, to ascertain the Fact?
I did; I went to the Parish Clerk who had been living for Sixteen Years in the Parish close to Queen Street, and he never heard of a Mr. Robinson a Clergyman, as a Resident in the Parish; I went to an old Friend of mine also who was Churchwarden of the Parish for many Years, a Mr. Gibbons, who is a constant Attendant at the Church, and he never heard of him, and I believe Mr. Gibbons has been living there these Thirty Years or more.

Are you much acquainted with the National Schools in Ulster?
I have visited a considerable Number of them.

Are they, generally speaking, in a better State than those that you found in the rest of Ireland belonging to the Board?
The Schools in Ulster generally have from the earliest Period been in a better State than in other Parts of Ireland.

Are there many of the Schools in Ulster in which you found the Regulations of the Board violated?
I found them violated in some.

Are there many?
In a considerable Number.

In what Particulars did you find the Regulations of the Board violated?
In having the Scriptures read at the Time for combined Instruction.

Did

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Did you find in Ulster that the National Schools were more perverted to the special Uses of Protestants?
In that Case it would be so.

Were you in the habit of looking into the Report Books?
I was.

Have the Inspectors in Ulster in those Cases of Violation of the Rules often noticed such Violations?
I have a Recollection of some Reports stating that Books had been used in the Schools at improper Hours, which I supposed to mean at the Time devoted to Literary Instruction, and that Books that were not allowed by the Board were made use of then.

Did you find in Practice that the Inspectors would come unawares upon the Schools?
Judging from my own Experience as an Inspector of the Kildare Place Schools, I should think it a very difficult Thing, because an Inspector, if he has many Schools to visit in a District, will find it a difficult Thing to keep his Arrival in it unknown to the Teachers of the Neighbourhood; it is a Matter that they are all very much interested in, and they make Inquiry, and communicate with one another, I have no Doubt.

Have you ever found in any One School that you visited in Ulster that the Rules of the Board were strictly attended to?
Yes; I think I have found it, particularly in the Case of the Frederick Street School at Belfast, which appears to me to be a very well-ordered School; the Rules of the Board appeared to be adopted in it. It was formerly a Kildare Place School.

Did you understand there whether the Clergy of both Religious Persuasions attended the School?
The Presbyterian Ministers did not all attend it; I mean the orthodox Presbyterian Ministers.

Did any Clergymen of the Church of England attend it?
I know that One did so.

Did you make the same Observation with regard to any other School?
I do not recollect at this Moment.

In the other Provinces of Ireland have you found that Roman Catholic Books were often used at Times of common Instruction?
I have frequently found them used.

Do any particular Instances which may seem to you important occur to your Mind?
There was One very remarkable Case which I visited at Middleton in the County of Cork; the Middleton Female School.

Will you state what it was?
I saw the Roman Catholic Catechism in use at the Time of Literary Instruction.

Did you examine Schools under Monks and Nuns at all?
I have frequently done so. Middleton School is under the Care of Nuns.

In what State have you found the Schools under Monks and Nuns, generally speaking?
As far as regards Literary Instruction, Order, and the Cleanliness of the Scholars, I thought them Schools that deserved a good deal of Credit, as well as I could judge from the Kind of Visits I have paid them.

When was it that you visited the School at Middleton?
I visited it in the Month of February last.

You found them, as far as Cleanliness and Order went, in a good State?
Yes. I think they are taught to read well, generally speaking, and to write well, and there are a good many other Branches of Education well taught.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Did you find, in general, that the Regulations of the Board were observed in those Schools, in as far as might suit the Purposes of a System of common Education of Protestants and Roman Catholics?

I think the Schools under the Direction both of Monks and Nuns have very much a Leaning to the Roman Catholic Church, and very naturally so.

Can you state any Instances of irregular Practices which have a Tendency to inculcate the Roman Catholic Faith?

In the Nun School at Middleton I saw the Roman Catholic Catechism taught.

Were there any Protestants in that School?

I do not think there was One.

Do you think that any converted Protestants would have sent their Children to that School?

I think not. I visited some of the Monks and Nuns Schools so far back as Twelve or Thirteen Years ago, long before the Board was established, and I noticed in those Schools that at particular Periods the Practice of repeating Prayers, and of the Scholars making the Sign of the Cross, was adopted in them, and it seemed to me to give the Stamp of a particular Religious Bias to them. I rather think, from the Instance I have seen in King's Inn Street, and from that I saw in the Middleton Female School, where I witnessed the same Thing, that it is a Practice that is not altogether given up.

In the Middleton Female National School did you witness that Circumstance?

I did.

Will you state when, and under what Circumstances?

I have already given the Date of my Visit, which was the 24th of February 1836; it was on a Friday; Wednesday is the Day marked out in the Rules posted up in the Schools for Religious Instruction. I saw several Roman Catholic Catechisms in use, and also a Roman Catholic Prayer Book, both which I examined. The Clock struck at the Time I was in the School.

Do you recollect what it struck?

It struck Twelve, as well as I recollect.

What occurred then?

The Scholars in my View made the Sign of the Cross, and appeared to repeat a Prayer.

Did they in fact do it?

I did not hear them; I saw their Lips moving.

Did you see them make the Sign of the Cross?

I did see them distinctly make the Sign of the Cross, and I saw their Lips move as if they were repeating a Prayer.

Was it at Twelve o'Clock also that you visited the School in King's Inn Street?

I think it was Twelve o'Clock that struck; and from this Circumstance I should be inclined to think the Exercise is performed at that Hour.

You state that many Years ago you visited several Schools under the Superintendence of Monks and Nuns, and that you have since visited some of those Schools; did you perceive in any of those Schools that you have subsequently visited any Difference in the System of Education going on from that which was practised when you formerly visited them, or did it appear to you to be the same Mode of Education?

It appears to me to be the same Mode of Education in the Two Cases I have mentioned.

Were they under any Society before?

No.

Do you consider that those Schools under the Monks and Nuns are in a better State as regards general Education now than they were at the former Period of your Visit?

I should suppose they were better, because they had the Advantage of the

Introduction of the elementary Books of the Board, which are very good Books,—well arranged. *Mr. Lewis Mills.*

Do you attribute that Improvement to their being in connexion with the Board or not?
Certainly in that respect I do.

Did you ever find Protestant Children present at the Religious Instruction given by Monks or Nuns?
Never. They might have been there although I did not know the Fact.

Were you ever at the Dungarvan Schools?
Yes.

Were you ever told there any thing respecting the Attendance of Protestant Children?
I was told there by One of the Monks that some Time before my Visit some Protestant Children had attended the School, and at the Time for Religious Instruction he left it to their Option whether to go Home or remain, and that they did remain.

The Query being to be answered satisfactorily to the Board, "Will you take care that no Children be present at any Religious Instruction or Exercise except those whose Parents consent to their being present?" the Monk told you that he did not require the Children to go away if they themselves chose to stay?
That was the very Way in which I understood his Statement.

Were there any peculiar Circumstances attending that School?
There are Four Schoolrooms in that Building, all under the Care of Monks. In the First Schoolroom that I went into I found several Classes engaged in reading the Roman Catholic Catechism, and other Classes in the same School at the same Time engaged in common Literary Instruction.

Do you recollect the Doors of those Schoolrooms?
I do.

Was there any thing remarkable in those Doors?
There was a Hole in each Door, and a sliding Board to enable a Person standing in the Room to see and talk to Persons outside of the Door.

Would it enable him also to see whether Persons were to be admitted or not?
Of course it would.

Was that common in the Schools that were under Monks?
I do not recollect noticing it in any other Case.

Were there any Protestants in that School when you visited it?
No, but the Monk told me that there had been some. The Rector of the Parish has recently established a School which I visited.

When the Monk told you that some of the Children remained during the Religious Instruction, did you understand from him that they joined in the Religious Instruction?
I asked him a Question which bore upon that Point; I asked him how he treated the different Points of Religion on which Protestants and Roman Catholics differed; he said his Practice in the Explanation of those Points was to exhibit what was the Belief of each Denomination according to his Interpretation of their Belief, and then to let the Scholars draw their own Conclusions.

Then did you understand from him that those Protestant Children that did not go Home, but remained voluntarily, did join in the Religious Instruction given to the Roman Catholic Children?
I cannot say a Word about it beyond what I have said in further Explanation of the Case. When he mentioned his Practice, I told him that if I had Children to send to School as a Protestant I would not send them to one conducted as this.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

Are you aware that in any of those Monks Schools under the Board they have been able to convert One single Protestant Child to the Roman Catholic Religion?

I have heard that there have been Protestant Children who have become Roman Catholics.

From the Instruction that they got at those Schools?

I cannot say that.

Where was it supposed to have taken place?

At the School at Youghal; but I cannot say whether it was so or not in reality.

You have not visited the School at Youghal?

Not since that Time; I did some Years ago.

When you visited this School at Middleton, were you looked at through this sliding Board?

No.

Did you find it open or shut?

I do not recollect.

Is it your Opinion that those Schools superintended by Monks and Nuns are reckoned peculiarly objectionable by the Protestant Population of Ireland?

As far as I can understand the Opinion of Protestants respecting them, it appears to me that they look upon them as Roman Catholic Institutions.

Then they object to them more than they do to other Schools of the Board that are under more ordinary Circumstances?

I should think there would be less Disposition on the Part of Protestants to send their Children to Monks and Nuns Schools; at the same Time that the Literary Instruction given in them generally is, as I have already said, efficient, as well as I can judge.

Have you found that the Protestants were also prone to object to Schools in immediate Connexion with the Chapels or in the Chapel-yards?

I have.

The Committee have been informed as to many Objections entertained by Protestants with respect to the Scripture Extracts and other Things; will you state what Alteration in the National System you think would be such as to induce the Protestants of Ireland to give more Support to it than they now do?

There is one Thing that probably would, but even more Alterations than that would be necessary in other Particulars; that is, if there was a Scriptural Class in all the Schools, so that though the Attendance of the Children of a particular Denomination might not be enforced upon it, yet that the reading of the Scriptures in the School should not occur before or after School Hours, but form an integral Part of the Business of the School. That would be an Alteration likely to induce many Protestants to look with a more favourable Eye upon the System of the Board; but at the same Time I am bound to declare this: I have had now Eighteen Years practical Experience of the Schools of Ireland from one End of the Kingdom to the other; in any thing I say respecting the Schools of the Board, I have no earthly Object but to tell the Truth, and to strive to be of Use to the Country; and it is my deliberate Opinion and Conviction that no one System of Education whatever will answer for Ireland; I think there must be Two.

You have said that you think the Establishment of a Bible Class in School Hours would tend to reconcile many Protestants to this System; that would be because they would be sure that the Protestant Children would have the Opportunity of reading the Bible?

Just so.

Would the Protestants be satisfied if it was a fundamental Rule of those Schools that no Child should be expected to read the Bible unless their Parents wished it?

There is a good deal of Variety of Opinion amongst the Protestants, from what

Mr. Lewis Wilks.

what I collect upon that Subject; there is a large Number of Protestants who would object to any System of Education for the Instruction of the Poor where the reading of the Scriptures did not form a Part of the Business of the School every Day, and where the Scriptures were not read by every Scholar in the School fit to read them; in fact upon the Plan of the Kildare Place Society, where it would be made the Law of the School to read the Scriptures, but to use no Compulsion in forcing Attendance whatever; if they did not like the School they need not make use of it. The Synod of Ulster has also put forward, upon the Part of the Presbyterian Body, that if a Bible Class is formed in the School, and the Attendance on that Class regulated by the Opinions of the Parents and Guardians of the Scholars only, it would give them Satisfaction as it relates to this Point.

Would that satisfy a large Portion of the Protestant Clergy of that Country?

I do not know; I would be unwilling to go so far as to say that, or to speak for them.

Did you never hear what has been put forward by the Clergy of one of the Northern Dioceses?

I am aware that in the Diocese of Derry some Clergymen have come forward and made a Statement respecting Changes which they wished for in the System of the Board in several fundamental Principles.

Would the Synod of Ulster, or would any Body of the Protestant Clergy, be satisfied with the reading of the Scriptures as you have mentioned, provided it was understood that neither the Schoolmaster nor the Clergyman of any Persuasion was to be allowed to interfere upon those Occasions to influence the Children to stay?

I do not think it would satisfy them if they could not advise the Scholar's Attendance upon the Bible Class.

You think they would insist upon its being left free to the Master to endeavour to influence the Roman Catholic Children to remain at the reading of the Scriptures?

I think that if the local Patrons and Teachers had not the Privilege to invite the Roman Catholic Children in the School to attend the Scripture Class they would not join in the System; that is my deliberate Opinion of the Protestant Clergy.

Then is it your Opinion that if such a System as that was adopted the Roman Catholic Children would be allowed by their Priests to attend those National Schools?

I do not say that as a Body the Roman Catholic Priests would formally allow them to attend; but I have no Doubt whatever that the Roman Catholic Children would attend, in fact.

Do you think the Parents of the Roman Catholic Children would encourage them to attend if it was left to the Schoolmaster to endeavour to influence them to read the Scriptures?

In using the Word "influence" I do not mean to ascribe to it any other Meaning than Persuasion; nothing beyond their Recommendation of Scripture Reading to Roman Catholics as a Duty which they ought to perform.

Do you think if it was understood that the Schoolmaster was to be allowed to endeavour to persuade those Children to stay and read the Scriptures as a Duty by them to be performed, that the Parents of those Children would in any great Numbers allow their Children to attend the School?

Decidedly so; and I at once appeal to the Experience of the Kildare Place Society. In 1824 the sworn Returns made by Roman Catholic Clergymen showed above One Half the Scholars in the Society's Schools were Roman Catholics.

Was not the Douay Version in use in the Kildare Place Society?

In several Schools it was used concurrently with the Authorized Version.

Seeing that the Questions that have been put to you do not pre-suppose the Use of the Douay Version, but the Authorized Version, is it still your Opinion that the Children would attend those National Schools if the Alteration suggested was to be made in them?

It is. For a Time perhaps they may be kept away; if the Schools be fairly

Mr. Lewis Mills.

and honestly conducted they will eventually succeed. I think, too, that the "Douay" Version could be usefully employed, when demanded, in a mixed School.

Do not you think that such a System as you suppose would bring the National System of Education very near to the same Point of the Kildare Place System, where the Roman Catholics objected to it?

There would still be a wide Difference, because we require the Scriptures to be read by every Scholar fit to read them; the other leaves it open, and only extends to a Recommendation to read them.

Has there recently been any great Increase in the Use of the Scripture Lessons in the National Schools?

There has.

To what do you attribute that?

They have been latterly supplied free of all Expense by the Board to the different Schools.

Have there been any Exertions to get them used, as well as supplying them gratuitously?

They have been frequently recommended to the Use of the Schoolmasters by the Inspectors of the Board, as I collect from various Reports made by them in the Books of the Schools.

Can you mention any particular Instance or Illustration of the comparatively greater Eagerness to introduce those now than what there was a Year or Two ago?

I recollect a singular Instance; it was in the School at Tullow in the County of Carlow, under the Board, which I visited; it was taught by Monks, and in speaking with One of them he said that they had the Scripture Lessons in the School, but that they had not read them of late so much as they had some Time before.

When was this?

It was in 1835, on the 7th of May, that I visited the School.

What further passed?

I asked him the Reason of that, and he said that a Change had taken place in the Ministry.

This was in May 1835?

Yes; and that during the Time that the Duke of Wellington's Administration was in Power they read the Scripture Lessons a great deal more than they did after the Change took place.

Did they say that they had been told by any Persons that they were more at liberty or less at liberty at that Period than at the other?

He stated to me, seriously or not I cannot say, that they had to read them, as I understood him, a good deal more before the Change of the Ministry.

Are you sure of what he did say?

In Substance I am.

Are you sure that the Substance of what he said was, that in consequence of the Change of Ministry they read the Scripture Extracts less?

That is the Substance of it.

Where were you Inspector under the Kildare Place Society?

I visited almost all Parts of the Country.

How many Inspectors had they?

We have at present Two; we had Eight at the Time the Society had Aid from Parliament.

What was your District?

The last Year that we had Parliamentary Assistance, Part of the North of Ireland was my District.

Mr. Lewis Mills.

What led you to that Part of the Country when you visited the Schools at Middleton and Dungarvan?

I was on an Inspection; we had a School in our Connexion in the Town of Middleton, which I visited that Day.

Will you explain to the Committee,—what do you mean by the Word "Monks"?

I understand by them Persons who make a Vow to educate the Poor, and to receive no Pay for it, and to lead a Life of Celibacy.

Do you understand by the Word "Monks" Persons in Holy Orders?

They are called Monks throughout the Country by the People. I do not know as to Holy Orders, what the Case may be.

Do you know any thing about them?

I do not, further than I have stated.

Do you conceive them to be Persons who are under certain Vows of Celibacy?

Under a Vow of Celibacy, as I am informed.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

THOMAS F. KELLY Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows:

Upon a former Occasion you were desired to produce the Trust Deeds of certain Schools; do you now produce them?

I do.

In a Case where there are several Trustees is Care taken to fill up the Vacancy when One occurs by Death?

Care is taken.

Supposing that Care were not taken, in case all the Trustees were to die without Care having been taken to fill up where One had vacated, what would be the Effect; would the Board lose all legal Hold upon the Property so held in Trust?

No, I think not.

They would be able to go to the Court of Chancery?

I think they would upon the general Construction of the Covenant.

Have you the Trust Deed of the King's Inns Street National School, and of the Robert's Town School?

I have.

Have the goodness to deliver them in?

The same are delivered in, and are as follow:

This Indenture, made the 30th Day of August in the Year of our Lord 1834, between the most Reverend Daniel Murray of Mountjoy Square in the County of Dublin, Doctor of Divinity, of the First Part; Augustus Frederick Duke of Leinster, Richard Lord Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Reverend Daniel Murray, Doctor of Divinity, Francis Sadleir, Doctor of Divinity, James Carlile, Clerk, Anthony Richard Blake and Robert Holmes, Esquires, Commissioners appointed for administering the Funds placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, of the Second Part: Whereas by Indenture of Assignment bearing Date the 10th Day of June in the Year of our Lord 1834, Michael O'Brien of Clarence Street, Builder, in the City of Dublin, for the Considerations therein mentioned, did demise and set unto the said Daniel Murray all that and those that Lot or Piece of Ground in King's Inns Street in the County of the City of Dublin, containing, by common Estimation, Forty-eight Feet in Front and Seventy-five Feet in Depth, be the same more or less, bounded as follows, that is to say, on the South by said King's Inns Street, on the North by Part of the Duke of Leinster's Estate, on the West by Premises now or late in the Occupancy of Mr. Robert Spence, Stone Cutter, and on the East by a Stable Lane leading from said King's Inns Street to the Rear of Old Dominick Street, to hold

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

unto the said Daniel Murray, his Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, for and during the Rest, Residue, and Remainder of a Term of 999 Years commencing from the 25th Day of March 1833: And whereas there has been lately built and erected on the Ground herein-before mentioned a Schoolhouse for the Education of the poor Children (Male and Female) in King's Inns Street aforesaid, in the Parish of St. Mary's in the County of the City aforesaid, and which is now finished and properly adapted to the Purposes of Schools such as those intended to be established as aforesaid, and the said Commissioners have, upon the Application of the said Daniel Murray, and in order to promote the Establishment of the said School, directed that a Sum of 533*l.* Sterling should be paid unto the said Daniel Murray out of the said Fund placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as aforesaid, which said Sum of 533*l.* Sterling, together with another Sum of 267*l.* Sterling raised by voluntary Contribution or locally subscribed, makes up the Sum of 800*l.* Sterling, which Sum has been actually laid out and expended in the Erection of the said Schoolhouse on said Lot of Ground in the Parish and Lordship of St. Mary's aforesaid, agreeable to the Conditions required by the said Commissioners in granting Aid for that Purpose: Now this Indenture witnesseth, that the said Daniel Murray, for the Consideration aforesaid, and in order to effectuate the Purposes aforesaid, doth hereby covenant, promise, and agree, for himself, his Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, to and with the said Commissioners, Parties hereto, and their Successors for the Time being, that he shall and will stand possessed of and hold the said Ground and Premises in and by the said in part recited Indenture of Lease demised and granted for and during all the Rest, Residue, and Remainder of the said Term of 999 Years as are now to come and unexpired, subject to and upon the Trusts, Regulations, Uses, Conditions, and Purposes herein-after mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same; that is to say, that each and every School to be kept and established on the Premises hereby granted shall be kept open for Five Hours on Four or Five Days in each Week, at the Discretion of the Commissioners for the Time being acting under the Authority of the Lord Lieutenant or other chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, in the Application of such Funds as may from Time to Time be at his or their Disposal for the Purpose of educating the Poor of Ireland, and shall during said Days be used for Moral and Literary Education only, and that the remaining One or Two Days in the Week, as the Case may be, shall be set apart for giving separately such Religious Education to the Children, Male and Female, of all Persuasions, as may be approved of by the Clergy of their respective Persuasions; such Clergy, however, to be permitted and encouraged to give Religious Instruction either before or after the ordinary School Hours on the other Days of the Week; and further, that the entire Control over all Books to be used in the said Schools, whether for the Purposes of combined Moral and Literary Education or of separate Religious Instruction, shall be from Time to Time and at all Times vested in the said Commissioners, Parties hereto, or other such Commissioners as aforesaid their Successors for the Time being, none of the said Books to be used or employed in such combined Moral and Literary Education except under the Sanction of the said Commissioners for the Time being, nor in such separate Religious Instruction but with the Approbation of such of the said Commissioners for the Time being as shall be of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended; and further, that all the Master and Masters, Teacher and Teachers of said Schools for the Time being shall not only in the first instance, before they shall be so appointed, have received previous Instruction in the Model School in Dublin sanctioned by the said Commissioners, and shall also have obtained from the said Commissioners for the Time being Testimonials of good Conduct and general Fitness, but shall be liable to be fined and fineable, removed and removeable, or suspended, from Time to Time and at all Times, when and as often as such Commissioners as aforesaid for the Time being shall deem it necessary, at their Will and Pleasure, in such Way and Manner as they shall deem expedient or see fit; and further, that the said Commissioners or their Inspectors for the Time being, or any of them, shall from Time to Time and at all Times hereafter be allowed and permitted, on Demand, to visit and examine the said Schools whenever and so often as they or any of them shall think fit or deem it necessary: Provided always, and it is hereby further expressed and declared to be the true Intent and Meaning of these Presents and of the several Parties hereto, that in case the said Daniel Murray, his Executors, Administrators, or Assigns, or any Trustee to be appointed by virtue of these Presents, shall die, or be desirous of being discharged from the Trusts hereby created, or shall go to reside out of Ireland, or shall neglect or refuse or become incapable to execute such Trusts, it shall and may be lawful to and for the surviving or continuing Trustees or Trustee to nominate and appoint a new Trustee or Trustees in the Room of any such Trustee or Trustees, such new Trustee or Trustees to be first approved of by the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being; and in case such surviving or continuing Trustee or Trustees shall decline, neglect, or refuse to exercise the Powers of Appointment hereby given as aforesaid within Six Calendar Months after all or any of the Events herein-before mentioned shall arise, happen, or take place, that then and in all or any of such Case or Cases it shall and may be lawful to and for the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being to nominate and appoint such new Trustee or Trustees in the Room of any

659

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

such Trustee or Trustees as aforesaid, upon the like Trusts as are herein-before mentioned, and that thereupon the said Premises herein-before mentioned shall be conveyed and assigned so as that the same shall vest in such new Trustee and Trustees so to be nominated and approved of as aforesaid, upon the like Trusts, and to and for the like Uses, Intents, Regulations, Conditions, and Purposes as are herein-before mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same: And the said Daniel Murray doth hereby, for himself, his Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, acknowledge, testify, and declare that he, and they his Executors and Administrators, shall and will from Time to Time and at all Times hereafter, upon the Request of the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being, and at their own proper Costs and Charges, do, perform, and execute all and every such further and other Act and Acts, Deed and Deeds, Assignment, Conveyance, Release, and Assurance in the Law whatsoever, as well for corroborating and confirming these Presents, as also for the further and better exchanging, assigning, assuring, and confirming all and singular the herein-before granted and assigned Lot of Ground and Premises, or intended so to be, to the several Uses, and upon the several Trusts, Intents, Regulations, and Purposes herein-before and hereby respectively mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same, as by the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being, their or any of their Counsel learned in the Law, shall in that Behalf be reasonably devised, required, demanded, or directed. In witness whereof the Parties aforesaid have hereunto put their Hands and Seals the Day and Year first above written.

D. Murray. (L.S.)

Rd Dublin. (L.S.)
Franc Sadleir. (L.S.)
James Carlile. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed, and delivered by the above-named

in the Presence of

Signed, sealed, and delivered by the above-named Commissioners of Education in the Presence of

---

This Indenture, made the 25th Day of June in the Year of our Lord 1834, between the Right Honourable Frederick Earl of Bessborough of Bessborough House, in the County of Kilkenny, of the First Part; Augustus Frederick Duke of Leinster, Richard Lord Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Reverend Daniel Murray, Doctor of Divinity, Francis Sadleir, Clerk, Doctor of Divinity, James Carlile, Clerk, Anthony Richard Blake and Robert Holmes, Esquires, Commissioners appointed for administering the Funds placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, of the Second Part; and the Right Reverend William Kinsela, D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory, of the City of Kilkenny, and the Honourable John William Ponsonby, commonly called Lord Viscount Duncannon, Trustees named and approved of by and on behalf of the said Commissioners appointed for administering the Funds placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant for the Purposes aforesaid, of the Third Part: Whereas the said Earl of Bessborough is well and sufficiently seised of all the Estate herein-after mentioned: And whereas it is the Wish and Intention of the said Earl of Bessborough and of the said Trustees, Parties hereto, that a School, with the Approbation and under the Control of the said Commissioners, also Parties hereto, shall be established in the Parish of Kilmakivogue in the County of Kilkenny: And whereas there has been lately built and erected on the Ground herein-after mentioned and demised a Schoolhouse for the Education of the poor Children (Male and Female) in the Parish of Kilmakivogue aforesaid, which is now finished and properly adapted to the Purposes of Schools such as those intended to be established as aforesaid, and the said Commissioners have, in order to promote the Establishment of said School, directed that a Sum of 71*l.* Sterling should be paid to the said Trustees, Parties hereto, out of the same Fund placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as aforesaid, which said Sum of 71*l.* Sterling, together with another Sum of 35*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Sterling raised by voluntary Contribution or locally subscribed, makes up the Sum of 106*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Sterling, which Sum has been actually laid out and expended in the Erection of said Schoolhouse on said Lot of Ground in the Parish of Kilmakivogue aforesaid, agreeable to the Conditions required by the said Commissioners in granting Aid for that Purpose: Now this Indenture witnesseth, that the said Frederick Earl of Bessborough, for the Considerations aforesaid, and in order to effectuate the Purposes aforesaid, and for and in consideration of the yearly Rent, Reservations, and Agreements herein-after reserved and mentioned, hath granted, bargained, sold, assigned, transferred, and made over, and by these Presents doth grant, bargain, sell, assign, transfer, and make over, unto the said Right Reverend William Kinsela and Lord Viscount Duncannon, as Trustees as aforesaid, their Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, all that and those that Lot or Piece of Ground situate, lying, and being at Robinstown in the Barony of Ida and County of Kilkenny, whereon there hath been lately erected and built a Schoolhouse for the Education of the poor Children in the Parish of Kilmakivogue aforesaid, containing in Front One hundred and forty-seven Feet, or thereabouts, and in

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

Breadth in the Rear One hundred and forty-seven Feet or thereabouts, and in Depth from Front to Rear on the North, East, South, and West Sides thereof One hundred and twenty Feet, or thereabouts, which said Lot of Ground is mered and bounded as follows; that is to say, on the North by the High Road leading from Kilmacow, to Glanmore Village, on the East by Part of the Lands of Robinstown in the Possession of the Widow Doyle, and on the South and West by another Part of the Lands of Robinstown now and for some Time past in the Occupation and Possession of James Cashin, which said Lot contains One Rood, Irish Plantation Measure, be the same more or less, together with all Buildings and Improvements erected and made thereon, and all and singular the Rights, Members, Privileges, Passages, Appendancies, and Appurtenances to the said Lot of Ground and Premises belonging or in anywise appertaining, all which said Lot of Ground and Premises are more particularly described, laid down, and delineated by the Map or Survey thereof hereon inserted; to have and to hold all and singular the said hereby granted and assigned Ground, House, and Premises, with their Appurtenances, unto the said Trustees, Parties hereto, their Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, for and during the Term of Twenty-one Years, to be computed from the Twenty-fifth Day of March last, and for and during all such further Time and Term, upon the several Trusts, and to and for the Uses and Purposes herein-after mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same, and to and for no other Use, Trust, Intent, or Purpose whatsoever; they the said Reverend Doctor Kinsela and Lord Viscount Duncannon, their Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, yielding and paying unto the said Earl of Bessborough, his Heirs, Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, during the Continuance of this Grant and Demise, the Sum of One Penny on the Feast of St. Michael in each and every Year, if demanded: And it is hereby expressed and declared, and it is the true Intent and Meaning of these Presents, and of the several and respective Parties hereto, that the said Grant hereby made shall be and for ever remain subject to and upon the Trusts, Regulations, Uses, Conditions, and Purposes herein-after mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same; that is to say, that each and every School to be kept and established on the Premises hereby granted shall be kept open for Six Hours on Four or on Five Days in each Week, at the Discretion of the Commissioners for the Time being acting under the Authority of the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland in the Application of such Funds as may from Time to Time be at his or their Disposal for the Purposes of educating the Poor of Ireland, and shall, during said Days, be used for Moral and Literary Education only, and that the remaining One or Two Days in the Week, as the Case may be, shall be set apart for giving separately such Religious Education to the Children, Male and Female, of all Persuasions, as may be approved of by the Clergy of their respective Persuasions, such Clergy however to be permitted and encouraged to give Religious Instruction either before or after the ordinary School Hours on the other Days of the Week; and further, that the entire Control over all Books to be used in the said Schools, whether for the Purposes of combined Moral and Literary Education or of separate Religious Instruction, shall be from Time to Time and at all Times vested in the said Commissioners, Parties hereto, or other such Commissioners as aforesaid, their Successors, for the Time being, none of the said Books to be used or employed in such combined Moral and Literary Education except under the Sanction of the said Commissioners for the Time being, nor in such separate Religious Instruction but with the Approbation of such of the said Commissioners for the Time being as shall be of the same Religious Persuasion with the Children for whose Use they are intended; and further, that all the Master and Masters, Teacher and Teachers of said Schools for the Time being, shall not only in the first instance, before they shall be so appointed, have received previous Instruction in a Model School in Dublin sanctioned by the said Commissioners, and shall also have obtained from the said Commissioners for the Time being Testimonials of good Conduct and general Fitness, but shall be liable to be fined and fineable, removed and removeable, or suspended, from Time to Time and at all Times, when and as often as such Commissioners as aforesaid for the Time being shall deem it necessary, at their Will and Pleasure, in such Way and Manner as they shall deem expedient or see fit; and further, that the said Commissioners or their Inspectors for the Time being, or any of them, shall from Time to Time and at all Times hereafter be allowed and permitted, on Demand, to visit and examine the said Schools whenever and so often as they or any of them shall think fit or deem it necessary: Provided always, and it is hereby further expressed and declared to be the true Intent and Meaning of these Presents and of the several Parties hereto, that in case any of them the said Right Reverend William Kinsela and Lord Viscount Duncannon or the Survivor of them, or his Executors, Administrators, or Assigns, or any Trustee to be appointed by virtue of these Presents, shall die, or be desirous of being discharged from the Trusts hereby created, or shall go to reside out of Ireland, or shall neglect or refuse or become incapable to execute such Trusts, it shall and may be lawful to and for the surviving or continuing Trustees or Trustee to nominate and appoint a new Trustee or Trustees in the Room of any such Trustee or Trustees, such new Trustee or Trustees to be first approved of by the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being; and in case such surviving or continuing Trustee or Trustees shall decline, neglect, or refuse to execute the Powers of Appointment hereby given as aforesaid within Six Calendar Months after all or any of the Events herein-before mentioned shall arise, happen, or take place, that then and in all or any of such Case or Cases it shall and may be lawful to and for the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being to nominate and appoint such

661

T. F. Kelly, Esq.

new Trustee or Trustees in the Room of any such Trustee or Trustees as aforesaid, upon the like Trusts as are herein-before mentioned, and that thereupon the said Premises herein-before mentioned shall be conveyed and assigned so as that the same shall vest in such new Trustee and Trustees so to be nominated and approved of as aforesaid, upon the like Trusts, and to and for the like Uses, Intents, Regulations, Conditions, and Purposes as are herein-before mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same: And the said Right Reverend William Kinsela and Lord Viscount Duncannon do hereby, for themselves and the Survivors of them, their and his Executors, Administrators, and Assigns, acknowledge, testify, and declare that they and the Survivors of them, their and his Executors and Administrators, shall and will, from Time to Time and at all Times hereafter, upon the Request of the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being, and at their own proper Costs and Charges, do, perform, and execute all and every such further and other Act and Acts, Deed and Deeds, Assignment, Conveyance, Release, and Assurance in the Law whatsoever, as well for corroborating and confirming these Presents as also for the further and better exchanging, assigning, assuring, and confirming all and singular the herein-before granted and assigned Lot of Ground and Premises, or intended so to be, to the several Uses, and upon the several Trusts, Intents, Regulations, and Purposes herein-before and hereby respectively mentioned, expressed, and declared of and concerning the same, as by the said Commissioners or their Successors for the Time being, their or any of their Counsel learned in the Law, shall in that Behalf be reasonably advised, devised, required, demanded, or directed. In witness whereof the Parties aforesaid have hereunto put their Hands and Seals the Day and Year first above written.

BESSBOROUGH. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed, and delivered by the Right Reverend William Kinsela, D.D., and Lord Viscount Duncannon, in the Presence of } *Henry Purcell.*

Rd DUBLIN. (L.S.)
FRANC SADLEIR. (L.S.)
JAMES CARLILE. (L.S.)

Wm KINSELA, D.D., &c. (L.S.)
DUNCANNON. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed, and delivered in the Presence of } *John Bannister*, Footman to Lord Bessborough.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 12° Maii 1837.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THOMAS FINN, LL.D., is called in, and examined as follows: *T. Finn, LL.D.*

You are one of the Inspectors under the Board of Education?
I am.

During how long a Time have you been an Inspector?
I was appointed on the 1st of September 1833.

In what District have you acted?
My first Tour of Inspection was through the Counties of Westmeath, Longford, Roscommon, and Galway. I was sent at that Time as an auxiliary Inspector.

In what Year was that?
In 1833.

Did you generally go to the same Parts of the Country or different Parts?
In 1834 I was appointed to Donegal, Derry, and Tyrone; Armagh had been put upon my List in the Beginning of the Season, but I had so much Business to do that it was handed over to another Inspector; and in 1835 my Tour was the same.

What was your Tour in 1836?
In 1836 I was in Clare, Limerick, Kerry, and Cork.

Were you ever employed on any special Missions?
I was.

Where were they?
I remember one in the County of Derry.

When was that?
I think it was in 1834; I am not sure whether it was in 1834 or 1835.

Where was that to?
It was close to Port Glenone. The Name of the School is Tyanee.

What was it about?
There was a Charge made to the Board complaining of the improper Conduct of the Managers and Patrons of the School in dismissing a Teacher without sufficient Grounds.

Was it an important Case?
I do not think it was.

Do you recollect any other special Mission upon which you have been sent?
Yes; in the County of Kerry in 1836.

What was the Name of the School?
Killarig National School.

Was that an important Case
I will state the Case; it was charged that our Books were not used in the School.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Was that a Charge against the Master or against the Patron?
The Charge was transmitted to me in the Shape that I mentioned, that our Books were not used in the School, without any Statement whose Fault it was; and also that the Teacher kept a Public House. Those were the Two Charges that I was required to investigate.

What was the Result?
I travelled I think Twenty Miles that Day in order to come upon the School by Surprise, with a view of ascertaining whether our Books were in actual Use. It was early in April. I went to both the Schools, both Male and Female, carelessly, and as if I was a perfect Stranger. I examined minutely all the Books, whether those lying upon the Tables or in the Desks or in the Hands of the Children, and I found no single Book in use, nor within the Precincts of the School, as far as I could discover, but the Books published by the National Board.

Then the Charge was dismissed?
So far as regards that Portion of it it was.

Were the Scripture Extracts in use in the School?
They were.

Did they appear to have been frequently used?
As far as their Appearance showed.

Are you a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?
A Roman Catholic.

What is your Tour this Year?
I have been through Queen's County, and have partly got through the County of Kilkenny, but only a very small Portion of it.

What great Differences are there that strike you between the Schools in the Northern and in the Southern Parts; those which are most remote and dissimilar in the Character of their Population; which would you say are the best and most regularly conducted, and in which are the Scripture Extracts most read, and in which are the Scriptures read, over and above the Scripture Extracts?
I think the Schools in the South read as uniformly and as numerously the Scripture Extracts as they do in the North, as far as fell under my own Observation; and if your Lordships will allow me to refer to a Document I shall be able to point out in how many of our Schools the Scripture Extracts were not read during my Tour of 1836. I find that for the Year 1836 throughout the Four Counties within my Walk, the Counties of Limerick, Cork, Clare, and Kerry, there are only two Schools in all, and I can name the Schools, in which the Extracts were not read, though supplied with them.

Will you name those Schools?
The Schools are Athea in the County of Limerick and Inch in the County of Kerry.

How many Schools were there altogether in your Walk?
The entire Number of the Schools I visited or inspected, some of which were applicant Cases, was 180; I inspected as in operation 113, the applicant Cases included.

Were there any of those Schools which the gratuitous Grant of the Scripture Extracts had not yet reached?
There were only Four Schools to which our free Stock of Books, including the Extracts, had not been supplied.

Will you state the Names of those Four Schools?
Rathkeale in the County of Limerick, Tarbert in the County of Kerry, Ballylongford in the same County, and Kilgarvay in the same.

Do you consider the Non-supply of Books to those Schools to be merely an Accident, which has probably been by this Time remedied?
It is right I should observe with regard to Three of those Schools, that they had not been a Fortnight in operation before the Time of my Visit; the Schoolhouses were new; these Four Schoolhouses were recently built, and Two

T. Finn, LL.D.

Two of them had not been a Fortnight in operation before the Time of my Visit?

Which Two?
Tarbert and Ballylongford.

What was the Period of your Visit?
As well as I recollect it was early in the Month of April when I visited the Three first mentioned; 1836.

Then you have no particular Reason to suppose but that they may be in the Possession of the Extracts now?
I have no Reason to say whether they are or are not, because I have not visited there since that Time.

Is it the particular Wish of the Board that the Scripture Extracts should be used in the Schools?
I think so; their anxious Wish.

And you visited those Schools last April Twelvemonth?
I did; before they were furnished with the free Stock of Books.

You state that it was the Desire of the Board that these Scripture Extracts should be used in those Schools; would it not have been a Part of your Duty to apply to the Secretary of the Board in order that he might have some Communication with the Managers of the School with respect to furnishing them with the Scripture Extracts?
My usual Course in that Case is, in sending my Report, to embody in that Report, in answer to a particular Query, Suggestions such as I wrote in the Report Book; and I leave such Suggestions in the Report Book as may tend to remove any thing objectionable in the Management of the School. I also recommend the School to be supplied with whatever Necessaries I deem requisite, including Books among the rest.

Then you consider your Duty as concluded when you have made a Report to the Board of any Deficiency in any School that you visit?
I do; but I beg to say in explanation, that when I recommend the Patrons to apply to the Board for such Things as I deem necessary towards the efficient working of the School I request the Patron to refer the Board to my Report in which those Things have been pointed out as wanting.

Are you aware that about the Time you are referring to there was a Distribution going on of those gratuitous Supplies of Books as fast as they could be worked off, but that they could not be worked off fast enough to meet the Demands?
I am perfectly aware of that. Some of the Patrons mentioned to me that they were in communication with the Board for such Books, and their Answer was, that they did not know whether they should be able to furnish them with the Books for some Time to come, and that they were in progress of being prepared.

Have you examined the Children or heard them examined in the Substance of the Scripture Extracts in some of the Schools?
Yes, here and there; I cannot say that I went fairly through all the Extracts, for I took sometimes one Portion and sometimes another, and either myself in person, or through the Master, had them examined up and down in a certain Portion of the Scripture Extracts.

Will you state in what Proportion of the Schools the Children seemed to have a tolerable Knowledge of the Scripture Extracts of the School, and in what Proportion that Knowledge was deficient, and in what it was altogether wanting?
I would say, that taking into account all our Schools, at least those that fell under my Inspection in 1836, I am disposed to think, from a cursory Review at present, that there are more of the Schools that are deficient in a good substantial Knowledge of the Extracts, taking in the entire of the Numbers published, as a whole, than there are of Schools in which they are well known; that is, taking the several Numbers of the Scripture Extracts into account. But I would say

T. Finn, LL.D.

that there are more of them in which the Children know some Numbers, and know them tolerably well, than there are in which they are altogether ignorant of their Contents.

Did you observe a great Difference in the Degree of Knowledge acquired and the Degree of Regularity observed in those Schools where the neighbouring Gentry and Protestant Clergy visited and paid Attention to them, and in those Schools where they absented themselves?

From the general Scope of my Observations, I am disposed to say, indeed I may say with great Truth, that when I found a School not visited by the local Patrons, that the Absence of such Visits furnishes me in a great measure with primâ facie Evidence of the School not being under the most efficient Government.

The Question did not refer to the local Patrons, but to the neighbouring Clergy and Gentry, who though they might not be considered as the Patrons would have free and welcome Access to the School. You have found that some were visited by those, and others not; and the Question referred to the Difference between those Two Classes?

I can have no Hesitation in saying, as far as my Observation and Experience reaches, that those that were visited by such as you name were under more efficient Government than those that were not, taking for granted that the Efficiency of the Teachers in both Cases was similar.

In point of fact have you found many Schools which the Gentry and the Protestant Clergy were in the habit of visiting?

I did not find many in which the Protestant Clergy were in the habit of visiting, but I found very many which the Protestant Gentlemen were.

Did you meet with any Instances in which there had been any Complaints made of rude Reception given to the Gentry and Protestant Clergy visiting, and any thing that tended to discountenance their coming to inspect the State of the School?

I do not remember a single Instance in which there was any thing of the Kind, or bordering upon it.

You were not desired by the Board to inquire into any thing of that Kind during your Journies?

No, not directly; but I do consider it a Portion of my Duty to report to the Board if any such thing did occur to my Knowledge.

Did you make such Inquiries as would have brought any such Instances to your Knowledge if they had taken place?

I uniformly looked through the Report Book, when there was a Report Book, back to the Period of the former Inspection, for the Purpose of ascertaining who were in the habit of visiting the School, as well as what Observations they made at the Periods of their Visits. If I found none upon the Face of the Report Book, I asked whether any respectable Persons had visited, and I have been frequently told that they did visit, and in all Cases that they, the Teachers and local Patrons, were most anxious that respectable Persons should visit. I asked them why it was that they did not solicit those Visitors, whether Male or Female, to note in the Report Book their Opinion of the School as well as the Time of their Visit.

Did you find in those Schools Visitors Books?

Generally speaking, I did find Report Books, with a Column for such Observations.

Did you as a Matter of Course refer to those Books?

Uniformly.

Then if any of those Persons who have been alluded to were in the habit of visiting should you not have remarked it from seeing it in those Books?

I found in many Cases that the Master himself stated the Visits of Persons, So and So. I was not satisfied with a Visit being noted in the Master's Handwriting. I would much prefer to have seen the Visit noted by the Visitors themselves, and I always recommended the Masters of our Schools to request Visitors to note their Observations upon the Schools themselves.

667

T. Finn, LL.D.

Then if you found that there were no Signatures or but few Signatures of Persons in the Visitors Book, should you not have thought it your Duty to inquire from the Master how that Circumstance occurred?

Yes, I would ask the Teacher; more especially if the School was in a District to which resident Gentry were contiguous. With respect to many of our Schools it is not so, the resident Gentry residing far away.

Was there a considerable Portion of the Schools you visited that had been originally supported by either the Association or the Kildare Place Society, or some other Societies, and had afterwards been placed under the Board?

Yes; more especially in the North of Ireland, in the Counties of Derry and Tyrone, in my District.

Did you receive any Accounts or ascertain any Facts upon good Authority as to the comparative Numbers of Children that frequented those Schools, before and after their Junction with the Board, both in the North of Ireland and in the South?

I have nothing to guide me in stating the Number before our Connexion with the Schools, but I have a Memorandum that will show the Aggregate of actual Attendance in each of the Years that I have been in the Service of the Board.

Did you find in the North Schools where the Protestant Children were assembled to read the Bible before or after the School Hours?

Very many, as I have been informed and believe.

In those Cases was it the Schoolmaster, or who was it, that superintended that Bible Class?

The Master in, I should take it, Nine Cases out of Ten was deputed by the Clergyman or Clergymen, or by the Parents of the Pupils.

Have you ever found that the Case where the Master was a Roman Catholic?

Yes, I should say I have; I think in many Cases where the Master was a Roman Catholic, when the Clergymen of all Denominations, more especially the Protestant Clergyman, or the Parents of the Pupils, deputed him to hear the Children read the Scriptures either before or after School Hours.

Did you understand that in those Cases the Children were merely to be kept to correct Reading, or that there was an Explanation given them of the Meaning?

In those Cases I always understood that it was to be in mere correct Reading, without Reference to any Comments or Explanations.

Did the Roman Catholic Clergyman ever depute the Schoolmaster to read the Bible with the Children?

I think so. I have no Hesitation in saying that I met with more than One Instance of the Kind in the North of Ireland.

Did you ever happen to inspect the School at that particular Time?

I think I have visited Schools about the Period at which they were going on with that Process of Instruction.

That was before or after School Hours?

It was generally after School Hours; but knowing the general Time for the closing of the Schools for general Instruction I was anxious to get to the School before the Period at which the Religious Instruction would commence, which was generally speaking at Two o'Clock.

Did you understand that the Selection of the Portions which the Children were to read was left to the Discretion of the Master, or was pointed out to him by the Clergyman of either Denomination?

In those Cases where he was left to hear them read the Impression upon my Mind was that he took the Bible in detail, and got through it, without having his Attention fixed upon any particular Portion of it.

When you say "the Bible," do you mean the whole Bible, or merely the New Testament?

The whole Bible.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Upon those Occasions did you ever find, where the Roman Catholic Clergy were favourable to their reading the Scriptures under the Eye of the Schoolmaster, that the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Children read the Bible together?

Together. I do not know whether I might not say, with regard to the Cases where the Roman Catholic Clergymen gave their Sanction to the Practice, that, generally speaking, the New Testament was read more generally than the Old Testament.

You said you found many Schools in which the Protestant Children read the Bible either before or after School Hours; did you find any in which the Protestant Children read the Bible during School Hours irregularly?

In the Years 1834 and 1835 I found it was the Practice in some Schools, but, if my Memory serves me rightly, it was before they received our free Stock of Books; they had not School Books, and I consider that our Rules were so far violated by bringing in Religious Instruction, except before or after the general Instruction had commenced or ceased.

Was that the Practice in few Schools or in many?

Decidedly in a vast Majority of our Schools it was not the Practice, more especially in 1835.

And you ascribe it to their Want of Books?

At that Time, in those Schools where that was the Practice, they had not our Supply of Books, and in fact those Schools had no Books, generally speaking, at that Time but the Bible.

Had not they other Books which they were at liberty to purchase at Half Price?

They had no Half Price Books at the Period to which I advert, more especially in 1834. There are Parts of the Country where I have been informed and have Reason to believe that they find it extremely difficult, in the North of Ireland especially, having no direct Communication with Dublin, to get our Books.

You say this was in 1835; how did you find it in 1834?

In 1834 there were but few of our Schools furnished with our Books, and the Custom was much more prevalent in 1834 than in 1835.

Did you report it to the Board?

I felt it my Duty in all Cases to report it. I considered it a Deviation from our Rule, and any Deviation from our Rule I felt it my Duty to report.

You did in fact report all those Cases to the Board?

I reported all the Cases in which I discovered Religious Instruction at Mid-day-time to be introduced.

The Question refers especially to Bibles or Testaments being used in the Schools, which you say was a much more common Practice in 1834 than in 1835. Now in all those Cases did you report it to the Board?

I reported it in this Form: I was called upon to say what different Kinds of Books were in general Use in the School or even in individual Use; whether they were Bibles or Testaments, or whether there were Books not sanctioned by the Board. I apprized the Board, in answer to a Query in the School Report Sheet, that I found in the School such Books in use or partially in use, and sometimes lying in the School, if so.

Did you report in fact the Cases in which you found the Bible and Testament used in the Schoolhouses?

Yes; if in use during the Time set apart for general Instruction.

Did you find in 1835 the same Thing repeated in the same Schools?

I believe I have already stated that the Practice in 1835 was vastly less prevalent than in 1834, because in 1835 more Schools were supplied with our Books; and in my Opinion the Practice had been discontinued where the School was sufficiently supplied with our Books. I think there were a few Instances in which the same Thing was repeated in the same Schools, but in how many Instances I cannot state.

Did you visit the same District in 1834 and 1835?

I did.

Had

669

T. Finn, LL.D.

Had you any Acquaintance, before you came into the Employment of the Board, with the Schools for the Poor and the System of Tuition in any Part of Ireland?

I had no Opportunity of being minutely acquainted with them; I had been a good deal engaged in Education myself.

In what Part of Ireland?

In Dublin.

But in Country Parts you had not seen much of the Schools?

No, I had not.

Did you keep the School?

I did.

A Classical School?

A Classical School.

Have you ascertained or heard from any competent Authority the Character of the Books which were commonly read in the Country Parts of Ireland in Schools formerly; were there not some Books of very exceptionable Character for Children, and unfit for that Purpose?

I have occasionally, in my Visits to the Country, seen some of those Hedge Schools, and looking at the Quality of the Books that they used, I would say that there were some Books in the Hands of the Children that ought not to be in their Hands, and taking them as a whole they were not at all calculated to impart much Literary Knowledge, and some of them were positively objectionable.

Have you never found any of those Books in the Schools under the Board?

None of the Class of Books to which I advert at present. I found in some Cases Books that ought not to be there, inasmuch as they violated our Rules.

Did you make that Circumstance the Subject of Part of your Reports?

I would say uniformly it was a Subject that I was very particular in dwelling upon; I never omitted noting in my Note Book those Books, I mean those which I considered objectionable, and embodying such always in my Report.

Have you Reason to believe that in consequence of the Observations that were made in your Reports those Books were subsequently withdrawn or ceased to be used in the particular Schools in which you found them?

Upon my revisiting those Schools, which I was in the habit of doing where I found any thing specially objectionable in the Mode of conducting them, I was anxious to revisit them, and to come from a Distance upon them, and I think I may say that I found such Matters as appeared to me decidedly objectionable in the first instance remedied upon my second Visit.

Are you aware that according to the original Constitution of this Board one of the essential Conditions for Aid to be given to Schools was the finding Funds for the Half Price of the Books that should be used; that that was a Condition upon which Aid should be given?

I am not aware that there was any Portion of the Regulations that embodied exactly what is mentioned in the Question.

You are not aware that One of the Principles laid down by Lord Stanley in establishing the Board was, that they should refuse all Applications in which the following Objects were not locally provided:—First, a Fund sufficient for so and so; secondly, a permanent Salary; and, thirdly, a Sum sufficient to purchase Books and School Requisites at Half Price?

Yes, I am aware of their having laid down that Rule; I read it with some Care; but according to my humble Construction of it I thought it referred to supplying from Time to Time, after the School had been in operation, a Fund that would be sufficient to enable the Teachers and the Children to have the Benefit of Books at Half Price after they had been once established.

Were you never instructed by the Board in what was necessary in this respect?

In the Copy of the General Instructions that were given to me my Attention was directed to the several Rules and Regulations of the Board, and making myself minutely acquainted with those Rules and Regulations.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Are you aware that the very first Regulation of the Board to which your special Attention, you say, was called by the Board, requires that, "The Commissioners appointed for administering the Funds placed at the Disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant for the Education of the Poor of Ireland are ready to receive Applications for Aid towards the building and fitting up of Schools, the paying of Teachers, and the obtaining of Books and School Requisites, on the following Conditions:—First, they will require that local Funds be raised, first, for the annual Repairs," and so on,— "thirdly, for the Purchase of Books and School Requisites at Half Price." Were you aware that that was One of the Regulations to which your Attention was particularly called?

As it appears there, I have no Doubt but my Attention was directed to it; but I have been in Districts of the Country where, if you made it a Sine quâ non, before giving Aid, that that Fund should be first supplied, Education never, I will venture to say, would make its Way there.

In point of fact, now that it is brought to your Attention, do you remember that your particular Attention was called by the Board to those Rules of which that is the First?

My Attention was in my General Instructions drawn to the Rules and Regulations of the Board in general; I have no Recollection of my particular Attention being directed to that any more than to any other of the Rules and Regulations of the Board.

Then your particular Attention was called to those Regulations of which that is the First?

Yes; to the whole Body of the Regulations my particular Attention was directed.

But you said that if this Regulation were made a Sine quâ non you thought that Education could not be carried on in Ireland in the first instance?

In certain remote and poor and impoverished Districts it could not.

Is that the Description of the Districts in which you found that those Bibles and Testaments had been taken as the School Books?

I would say not.

Are you rightly understood that you considered yourself as entitled to use a Discretion, by departing from any Regulation when your own Judgment told you that in any particular District that Regulation could not be applied?

I did not consider myself as authorized to use any Discretion in the Case. There was a Query Sheet, which Query Sheet for an applicant School is filled up by the Applicant, and my Report upon that Case embodied my Views of the Necessity or otherwise of the Erection of the School in that District; noting the general Population, and in many Cases the Poverty and Wretchedness of the People, as may be.

The Question still is, whether you thought yourself at liberty, either because you considered that to require this as a Sine quâ non would make Education in certain Districts impossible, or for any other Reason, to depart from insisting upon that Regulation?

I did not feel myself authorized to dispense with that among the many other Rules of the Board; I did as I thought I was bound to do. In winding up my Report, in the Place for General Observations, I gave my Opinions generally, but without considering myself at all at liberty to dispense with any Rule or Regulation of the Board.

Are the Committee to understand, that as you considered it in those Districts impossible to carry into effect the Requisition of the Board, you thought it excusable that they should depart from it by bringing in any Books that they might Chance to have?

Not with reference to any Books, certainly. I mean that in those Districts to which I have alluded, where there was an Application made to the Board to establish a School, if the Board had rigidly adhered to the Rule of requiring Funds to be first raised for all the Purposes specified there, the People would be unwilling, because unable, to comply with the Conditions of the Board, and if the Board acted rigidly upon that the Result would be that there would be no School.

6/11

T. Finn, LL.D.

Do you mean to say that the Board did not act rigidly upon those Rules?
What the Practice of the Board was I cannot take upon me to say.

In point of fact, Schools were had where you think it would be impossible to have had them if the Regulations had been insisted upon as a Sine quâ non?
That is my own Conviction.

The Regulation that you allude to is, that they should pay Half the Price of the Books?
My Answer included more than that.

How much did it include?
I refer to the Regulation by which they had to create a Fund in the first instance sufficient to meet all the Purposes specified in one of the Rules by Lord Stanley's Direction, for keeping the Schoolhouse in order, for purchasing Books at Half Price, and all the other Objects specified in that Rule. If the Board of Education insisted upon that Fund being raised before they gave them any Hope of Assistance I do not think that Schools could be established in those poor Districts.

What do you mean by "Hope of Assistance;" do you mean by that, before they undertook to give them so much in aid, or before they made an actual Grant?
If the Board said, "In no District, however poor, shall we afford Aid until you collect a Fund available for those Purposes, and when you do so we shall take the Case into consideration, but not before;" my Answer referred to such a Case.

Did you understand that it was to meet that Difficulty that gratuitous Grants of Books were made by the Board?
The Impression upon my Mind is, that it was as well to meet that Difficulty as also to remove from the Schools Books which would not meet the Approbation of the Board. The latter never could have been done, in my Opinion, till such Time as gratuitous Grants were supplied.

You are of course aware of Query No. 12. which will be now read to you, in the Query Sheet for Applicants for Aid towards the fitting-up of Schools, namely, "Are you disposed to use the Books prepared and issued by the Board? If not state the Titles of those Books which you purpose to use;" do you know whether it was required that that Query should be always answered satisfactorily or not?
According to my View of the Wish of the Board they required that to be answered satisfactorily.

If that Question had been answered by the Applicants for Aid towards the fitting-up of Schools in such a Manner as to satisfy the Requirements of the Board; would it not have been necessary that they should have some Books which they could use without offending against the Regulation?
I think so; if they acted perfectly in the Spirit of the Answer which they gave to that Question, it would have been necessary that they should have had such Books as should not transgress the Rules of the Board.

Are you aware that in the Outset the Board was in the habit of granting no gratuitous Supplies of Books, or any thing else, but always requiring the Half Price to be paid?
Perfectly aware of it; at least it was the Case when I was appointed Inspector.

Do you recollect that, finding that several Schools were too poor to pay that Half Price for the Outfit, a Resolution was come to by the Commissioners to send a gratuitous Supply, not of all School Requisites, but of Books to start with and make a Beginning, meaning that the local Funds should keep a perpetual Supply of them for the future?
Perfectly.

Did you find other Books besides Bibles and Testaments in any of the Schools, or were those the only Books of an irregular Character that you actually found?
There were other Books, but not to the same Extent, or any thing at all like it; there were occasionally other Books of a Religious Character.

T. Finn, LL.D.

What other Books?

My Memory does not furnish me with more than One or Two Instances in which I found some Books which I considered as Books upon Religious Controversy; I do not think I met with more than One or Two Instances of that Kind, and only perhaps a solitary Book.

Were Bibles and Testaments the only Books not on the Board's List, and not having the Sanction of the Board, which you found in any Schools in 1834 or 1835?

There were several Schools in which there were Books not having the Sanction of the Board.

What Books?

I regard as Books having the Sanction of the Board Books either published by the Board themselves, which we call our National School Books, or certain Books belonging either to the Kildare Place Society or the Catholic Book Society; for I understood that the Board gave their Sanction, before they were able to furnish Schools with a free Stock of Books, to some of those Books that belonged to the Kildare Place Society, and to certain Books that belonged to the Catholic Book Society.

What Books besides Bibles and Testaments did you find in the Schools that were not according to the Board's Regulations?

The general Impression upon my Mind is that I did find in several of our Schools Books to which the Board had not given their Sanction. But in speaking of Books to which they had given their Sanction, I intend to include certain Books from the Kildare Place Society, and certain Books from the Catholic Book Society. All other Books that were introduced I considered as Books not having the direct Sanction of the Board.

Do you recollect or not to have found in Schools in the Year 1835 or the Year 1834 in several Instances Books which had not the Sanction of the Board, besides Bibles and Testaments?

I found in very many of our Schools, for example, several Species of Spelling Books. Now I do not look upon those as Books directly sanctioned by the Board. Spelling Books of different Denominations, from the Primer with Two or Three Sheets to the more enlarged One, which is called the Universal Spelling Book. I likewise found in many of them Voyages and Travels.

Were those Voyages and Travels published by the Kildare Place Society?

No, not all. I likewise found in some of them Scott's Lessons, Ewing's Elocution, and several Books of that Description.

Are those all that you found?

I found others; but I could be able to furnish your Lordships, in the course of some Time, with a List of any Books that I found, because I have their Names in my Note Books, for I always furnished the Board with the Names of such Books; I considered it my Duty to do so.

In fact you always reported to the Board when you found any Books that the Board had not sanctioned, and stated what those Books were?

Uniformly.

You were understood to say that those Books you have mentioned are the only Books that you recollect to have found not sanctioned by the Board used in the School at Times of general Instruction?

I believe I did not say so. I stated that I found other Books, but the Names of which I at this Moment forget.

Do you recollect the Names of any other Books?

I do not recollect the Names of any other Books.

Or the general Description of them?

With regard to other Books, taking them as a general Class, I would say that they were of that Class of Books that would not in themselves, I consider, be objectionable as containing objectionable Matter, but they were Books not well qualified to impart general Information.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Have you ever found Instances of Roman Catholic Catechisms in any of those Schools at the Time of general Instruction?
I have.

Had you forgotten that Class of Books when you were just now asked what Books, besides Bibles and Testaments, that were contrary to the Regulations of the Board, you had found in the Schools?
I understood the Question as bearing generally upon Books either of a controversial Tendency or Books such as were commonly used in Ireland; Histories of Robbers and of Persons of that Kind, that were not calculated to impart Instruction; and I did not intend to disguise or suppress the Fact, which I avow at once and cheerfully, that in some Schools I found Roman Catholic Catechisms in the Hands of Children.

At the Times of general Instruction?
At the Times of general Instruction.

In 1835 and in 1834, at the Time you were inspecting in the North, did you find that to be the Case in some Schools there?
Yes.

Did you at the Times when you have inspected in the South also find those Books frequently?
I do not think in the South I met with more than One or Two Instances of Schools where I found them, and I think it was limited to those Schools for which Application had been made to the Board, and not acknowledged National Schools, but Schools for which Application had been made to the Board; Schools in which the Children were obliged almost to seize what Books they could get for the Purposes of Instruction. In our National Schools, acknowledged as such, I have it not upon my Memory that I found in more than One or Two Instances Roman Catholic Catechisms in the South of Ireland.

You are speaking of some Schools which were not actually at the Time under the Board, but merely Candidates for being under the Board?
Merely Candidates.

Did you ever see a Roman Catholic Catechism in the Hand of a Protestant Child in any of the Schools?
I never did.

Did you know Protestant Children from Roman Catholic Children?
No, I cannot say that I did.

What you mean to say is, that you did not find the Roman Catholic Catechism in the Hands of a Child that you knew to be Protestant?
Yes, I mean that; and if I may be allowed to explain, wherever I did find Catechisms in the Hands of Children (and there were Instances in which I applied the Test) it was in the Hands of the youngest Portion of the Children, who were in very many Instances unable either to read or to spell it; for upon finding such Books in their Hands, and seeing the Youth of the Child, and feeling astonished that the Child being so young would be able to read or to spell, I took the Catechism, and desired the Child to spell it, and the Child was not able to do so in very many Instances.

Was it a Part of your Instruction to ascertain the comparative Number of Roman Catholics and Protestants?
For the Year 1836 it was; commencing in April of that Year.

Did your Report contain that Information?
Uniformly.

In every School which you visited in 1836 did you make that Inquiry?
I did uniformly.

Did you report in every Instance the Answers which you got?
I did.

In 1836 did not you visit the County of Limerick?
I did.

T. Finn, LL.D.

In the County of Limerick you made this Inquiry at every School?
I did.

And you reported to the Board?
In every School that I visited.

Do you know how many there were?
In the Year 1836 I inspected Twenty-four Schools in the County of Limerick.

And of those Twenty-four Schools you made a Report to the Board of the Number of Roman Catholic and Protestant Children severally?
I did.

Have you got an Account here of what your Return was of those Twenty-four Schools?
No; I have nothing here to guide me as to the Amount.

Have you any Account of the Report you made to the Board?
I have the Heads of the Reports.

Have you this particular Point;—the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in those Schools?
I have an Account of the gross Number upon the Books of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children respectively.

In all the Schools?
In all the Schools which I visited in 1836.

Have you the several Schools in the County of Limerick by themselves?
Yes, I have.

[The Witness is directed to furnish a Statement of these Particulars to the Committee.]

Were you informed by the Board or by any Person that this Return respecting the County of Limerick would not be included in the Return which the Board would give to this Committee?
I had no Communication of the Kind from the Board or from any Member of the Board.

From whom did you get the Information of whether they were Roman Catholic or Protestant?
From the Master.

In the Presence of the Boys, or privately?
I generally do it privately.

Did you ever in the Course of your Inspection in the North find Protestant Catechisms in use on the Days of general Instruction?
I did; the Established Church and the Presbyterian Catechisms.

Did you find those Books which you have enumerated some Time ago in use in the Schools after they had been provided with the Books from the National Board?
In very rare Instances indeed.

Are the Committee to understand that they were used only because they were not at that Time supplied with Books from the Board?
That is my solemn Impression.

You have said that in Two successive Years, in 1834 and 1835, you inspected the Schools in the County of Tyrone; do you recollect on one of those Occasions inspecting the School of Stranagalwilly in the County of Tyrone?
Distinctly, in 1835.

Do you remember that the Reverend Francis Brownlow, the Rector, had made a Complaint to the Board before you went?
Distinctly.

Do you remember what that Complaint was?
Yes, I do distinctly, for the Board transmitted his Letter to me; his Complaint was that Mass was celebrated in the Schoolhouse at Stranagalwilly.

675

T. Finn, LL.D.

The Reverend Francis Brownlow has long been the Board's Correspondent for the Schools?

He was the Patron upon my List.

Did you receive particular Instructions from the Board to investigate this Case?

Very particular.

Did you investigate?

I did.

What did you find to be the Result?

I will state the Course that I pursued. On my Way to the School I called upon Mr. Brownlow; he happened to be from home at the Time. I proceeded then to the School, and I looked at the Report Book for the Purpose of ascertaining whether the School was recorded to be held in the Schoolhouse upon that Day, for Mr. Brownlow did mention that the Scholars were dismissed. I found that the School was represented as being in operation during that Day. I asked the Master whether the School had been in operation upon that Day; I also asked him whether Mass was not celebrated at the School upon that Day. To this he replied, that the School had been kept open till Twelve o'Clock. I may observe, it was in a remote Mountain District; there is a Churchyard near it; a Roman Catholic, who died some Miles distant, was to be buried in this Churchyard.

Was the Churchyard adjoining the Schoolhouse?

The Churchyard is some Distance off.

By Church do you mean Roman Catholic?

I do not know; there is no Churchyard near the Schoolhouse, but there is one not far from it. The Master stated that the Person who was to be buried was a near Relative of his, and that he thought he might take the Liberty of dismissing the School about Twelve o'Clock, to go to the Man's Burial; and that Mass was celebrated, not in the Schoolhouse, but that, the Day being exceedingly wet, Mass was celebrated in the Porch leading to the Schoolhouse, and not in the Schoolhouse itself, and that he had kept his School open up to that Period which I have mentioned. Upon my Return from the School I waited upon Mr. Brownlow; it was after Nightfall; I found him at home, and I stated to him what I had been informed of, and asked him to draw upon his Recollection to know whether his Visit to the Schoolhouse was before or subsequent to Twelve o'Clock. He said he could not at the Moment be sure, but he thought it was somewhat about Twelve o'Clock; but that he thought he had a Mode of ascertaining whether it was before or after Twelve o'Clock, and took my Address, for the Purpose of informing me, so soon as he could discover, whether his Visit to the School on the Day in question was before or after Twelve o'Clock; but that the Impression upon his Mind was that it was rather before Twelve o'Clock.

Was that the only Point upon which Mr. Brownlow differed from the Statement which you gave to him from the Schoolmaster?

I stated to him then, as I state to you now, all I could ascertain. I made it my Business, in going to the Schoolhouse, to put some Inquiries to the People whether such a Thing as Mass being said in the Schoolhouse did not occur; and I told him the Allegation of the Master was, that Mass was celebrated in the Porch, and not in the Schoolhouse; and he did not then state to me that his positive Information was, that it was in the Schoolhouse, but that it was somewhere close to the Schoolhouse, or in the Schoolhouse itself.

Did you ask the People?

On my Way up I did.

What did they say?

The Majority of the People there are Roman Catholics, and therefore in such a Case I would receive with great Caution any Information upon those Points, more especially if they suspected me to be an Inspector wanting to get Information upon that exact Point.

What did they inform you?

They one and all informed me that it was in the Porch, and not in the Schoolhouse.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Did not Mr. Brownlow tell you at the Time that he was sure that the Schoolmaster had misled you, and that he would make further Inquiries into the Business, and would inform you of the Result?
Mr. Brownlow certainly did not allege any such thing, if I recollect rightly.

In fact, did he make any subsequent Communication to you?
Never; I gave him my Address, and was in the Neighbourhood for some Days.

Did you give him your Address that you would be at Omagh.
I did.

And no Letter from him reached you at Omagh?
Certainly not. I stated to him, that according to the Tour that I had struck out I should be in Omagh up to a given Time, and that I was to be in Strabane that Night. My Practice on leaving a Post Town is to leave my Address at the Post Office, with Instructions to forward all Communications directed to me. I stated to Mr. Brownlow that I should be in Omagh on a given Day, and should be happy to receive any Communication from him; but he made none; at least I received none.

How deep is the Porch you have spoken of?
I think it may be about Ten or Twelve Feet long by Six or Seven deep.

Then if a Statement were made that it was only Eighteen Inches in Depth that Statement would be very incorrect?
No Doubt it would.

Do you recollect what the Size of the Schoolroom is, having a Porch of those Dimensions?
I do not recollect at this Moment. Your Lordships could have that from my Note Book.

Was the Porch quite adequate to give the necessary Protection to the Priest, and to whatever the Priest required, for the Purpose of celebrating Mass?
And more than adequate.

Did you look at it with that view after you had heard of Mass being celebrated there?
I did, for the Purpose of ascertaining if it afforded Space enough for that Purpose.

Was the Schoolroom a very large one?
No, I do not think it was. I measured the Schoolhouse, but I did not measure this Porch. The Reason I did not measure it was, that we did not contribute towards building the Porch. If the Porch had been built at our Expense I would have deemed it my Duty to have measured it, with a view of showing the Board how their Money was expended. The Porch was a very indifferent one, and, as the Master told me, erected at his own sole Expense.

Was the Churchyard attached to any Place of Worship?
I do not think it was.

Did you see it?
No; there is neither Church, Chapel, nor Meeting House immediately close to that Place, as well as I remember.

But there is a Burial Ground?
There is an old Burial Ground, as I have been informed. I did not see it.

What do you mean by celebrating Mass; do you mean that there was an Altar raised, or was it merely a Funeral Service?
I take it to be more than that; it means saying the whole Liturgy as used in the Mass.

Is that usually done at Funerals now?
In many Cases it is done.

Is not it an ordinary Occurrence over the Body of a dead Person to have Mass celebrated?
I suppose it is in Six Cases out of Seven; it is decidedly the general Rule.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Is not that done in the House of the Dead, and not in the Churchyards?
Except in perhaps very fine Weather, it is celebrated in a House, and not in the open Air, and generally in the House of the Dead.

Did you visit the City of Limerick among others, and inspect your Schools there?
I did.

Did you inspect the National Board School that belongs to the Nunnery?
I did.

St. Mary's?
It is St. Mary's.

You visited that School in April 1836?
I did.

Did you make any Observations in the Report Book upon it?
I always leave my Report of my general View of the State of the School in the Report Book.

Do you recollect whether the Board's Paper of Commandments was hung up in the School?
I cannot draw upon my Recollection so far as to say whether or not it was.

Did you observe the Commandments in any other Form inscribed upon the Walls of the Room?
I remember there were a great Number of Scriptural Texts, taken especially from the Psalms, painted in several Compartments about the Schoolhouse. I have no distinct Recollection of any Copy of the Commandments being there. The Impression upon my Mind is, that there were a great Number of Scriptural Texts taken from the Psalms printed along the Walls of the Schoolhouse.

But you have no Recollection of the Commandments being so exhibited?
I have no Recollection; they may have been, but I have no Recollection of it.

If the Commandments had been there you would have noticed in what Form they were exhibited, should you not?
If they arrested my Attention I would then have noticed in what Form they had been exhibited.

Would not the very Fact of the Commandments exhibited upon the Wall in a National School Room, if it were not in the Paper of the Board, strike you as necessarily implying a Deviation from the Rules of the Board?
I did not say that it was upon my Mind whether or not the Commandments were there, but I very distinctly remember that there were Two or Three Dozen, I would say, at least a very great Number of Quotations which I took to be from the Psalms, and among those there may have been the Commandments. This Exhibition of so many Scriptural Quotations is a very unusual Thing in Schools.

Then you are quite clear that there were a great many more Sentences inscribed upon the Walls than the Number of the Ten Commandments would have amounted to?
There certainly were more than the Ten Commandments would occupy.

Do you recollect that there are Ten Windows in that Room?
I cannot say; I know it was a very large Room.

Do you recollect that over each Window there was a Commandment inscribed?
I have no Recollection of it.

In the course of last Year you visited the County of Cork; did you go to Carriglass, which is just adjoining the County of Waterford?
I did.

Did you visit that School last November?
I did.

Was any Complaint made to you by the Patron of the School against the Schoolmaster?
There was no Complaint made by the Patron of the School against the Schoolmaster; but I remember it was a Case in which Complaints were made.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Made by whom?

With your Lordships Permission I will state the Thing as it occurred. Upon my Arrival there, not having been there before, I asked where the National Schoolhouse was; I was told it was some Distance off, but I was told also that there were Two National Schoolhouses. "There can be only One," said I. One Person rushed up to me and said, "Sir, this is the National Schoolhouse;" pointing to a certain House. "Impossible," said I, "for there is no Inscription over it. I do not suppose there are Two National Schoolhouses." He wanted me to stop at the Schoolhouse to which he directed my Attention. I said "No." I went on to the other Schoolhouse. I entered that Schoolhouse upon which the Title of "National School" was. I think there were only Two or Three Children there. I found the Books in very great Disorder, tattered and torn and tossed about, and the Schoolhouse itself a very indifferent one; and I asked the Master how it came that the School was so thinly attended. I had not been long in the Schoolhouse when Two Persons followed me in; one turned out to be Mr. Sears, a Half Pay Officer, residing in the Village, and the other the Man with whom he resided. They mentioned to me the Circumstances at once, which made it necessary for me, as I thought, to hold an Investigation relative to the School. They stated that the Children had left because the Teacher of this School had from being a Roman Catholic turned Protestant. Mr. Sears wanted to go into the whole Case with me. I said, "Mr. Sears, is not it better to have all Parties Face to Face; not to hold an ex parte Investigation?" I was going on then with the Process of taking Notes, and making a Report relative to the School. He wanted me to go into the Case. I said, "I will give you a full Opportunity of bringing this Matter fairly before me; all Parties being present; but I think Delicacy and good Sense will suggest to you that it is better not to go into it till all Parties implicated are Face to Face." I retired then to Mr. Sears's, who lived close to the Place, and he said that the Priest had withdrawn the Children from the School in consequence of the Master being a Protestant. "Well," said I, "get me Evidence of that Fact." "I will," said he; "but you know it will be impossible for me to get it for you To-day." Said I, "Then appoint your Day; I will come back again; I will give you ample Time to get what Evidence you can; I shall either wait here or return at the particular Day you select for holding the Investigation." "But," said he, "the People will not give Evidence against their Priest." Said I, "That I cannot help; I give you every Facility in proving what you allege, and I will return to this Place whenever you shall appoint." He said he was quite sure that the Priest had caused the Withdrawal of the Children. By Appointment with Mr. Sears I fixed upon the second Day after for holding the Investigation. I imparted the Matter to the Rev. Mr. Hogan, who was the Roman Catholic Curate of the Parish, and stated to him that it would be necessary that he should come down to the Village and have an Investigation held.

Was he the Priest alluded to?

He was. I asked Mr. Sears what Witnesses he had to produce, that I might hold the Investigation publicly, when all Parties were present; and he said that he abandoned any Hope of being able to bring Testimony to this Effect; meaning that the Priest had caused the Withdrawal of the Children. "But," said he, "Mr. Hogan, I shall put it to you, and believe your Word as a Clergyman and a Gentleman, whether you have not influenced the Withdrawal of those Children." Mr. Hogan said, "If you put it to me in that Kind of Way I pledge myself as a Clergyman and as a Gentleman that the Children were withdrawn before I knew any thing about it." Said I, "Gentlemen, what is to be done in the Case?" The former Master (I mean Malony) was the Person then in Possession of the National School. The Master, before Malony's Appointment, had been superseded; there were Complaints made against him to the Board, and the Inspector then upon that Circuit was directed to investigate the Matter. He did investigate. The Complaints, if I recollect rightly, were, overcharging the Children, and being too frequently absent from the School Duties. Upon an Investigation into those Charges he was removed. Upon the Withdrawal of the Children from the Carriglass School, Mr. Hogan the Patron wrote to the Board, stating that the School had been deserted under the Teaching of the then Master, Malony.

679

T. Finn, LL.D.

Was that the Master who had conformed to the Protestant Religion?

Yes. His Predecessor had been removed upon those Accusations which I mentioned being made out against him, and which had been investigated by my Predecessor in that District, as I have already stated; and upon the Rev. Mr. Hogan the Correspondent representing that the School had been deserted under the Teaching of Malony (I do not think that he coupled that Representation with the Reason of its being deserted) he was directed by the Board to appoint a Successor to him. The Successor was appointed, and I thought most improperly appointed, because that Successor was the Person who had been removed upon an Investigation a Year before.

Was Part of the Charge against Mahony, the Schoolmaster who had been discharged the Year before, a Charge of Drunkenness?

Not being the Person to hold the Investigation, I cannot answer that Question; but the Gentleman who made the Inspection, and who reported upon it, Mr. Robertson, is in attendance upon your Lordships.

Was there any Complaint against Malony accompanying the Statement of the School being abandoned?

I am not aware, from the Tenor of the Board's Letter which I saw, that there was any Complaint against Malony further than that the School was abandoned under his Teaching, and was perfectly useless. I found, upon speaking to Malony, that under the Circumstances he did not wish to continue; he distinctly told me his Wish was to be paid up to the Time, and to retire. I suggested, under the Circumstances, to Mr. Sears and to the Roman Catholic Curate, (Mr. Sears himself having told me that it was not his Wish that Malony should continue,) that under all the Circumstances it was better to proceed to the Election of a new Master; that by all means Mahony must be removed, being not a fit Person, and having been removed upon Complaint before, and under no Circumstances should he be reinstated, "As it is the Master's own Wish not to continue: you say it is your Wish also, Mr. Sears." They both of them at once acquiesced in my Suggestion; they both seemed to think it was the better Course.

Did you see the Master, Malony, upon the Day when you visited the School in December last?

I did.

Had any Complaint been made to you against him for Immorality?

I have no Recollection that any Complaint for Immorality had been made to me relative to Malony.

Was any Complaint made for Neglect of the School against Malony?

I have no Recollection of any.

Or for Violation of any of the Rules of the Board?

I do not think there was.

But he expressed to you no Objection to quitting the School?

No; far from any Objection; he said he was very anxious to resign.

That was after all his Scholars had left him?

Yes; he stated it was not worth his while to continue under these Circumstances.

Who appointed the other Master, to whom you felt so much Objection?

The Correspondent of the School, the Reverend Mr. Hogan.

Did the Board make any Objection to his Appointment?

They were not aware who he was. He mentioned to the Board the Appointment of a certain Person, naming the Person, but he did not name him as the Person who had been superseded upon a Complaint the Year before. And as many of the Name of Mahony reside in this District, the Attention of the Board not being directed to it, they sanctioned the Appointment of Mahony, the identical Person who had been superseded.

Did not you think it your Duty to make the Board acquainted with that Fact?

Immediately; and he was removed directly.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Have you been in the habit of of inspecting the Schools in Dublin?
No; I never had Dublin in my Walk.

But though not specially intrusted with the Inspection of Dublin, have you not been in the habit of visiting the Schools in Dublin?
I never inspected a School in the City of Dublin. I may have gone into a School, and looked about and walked out again, without making any Report of the School, or examining into its Details.

Have you been in the habit of walking into the Schools in Dublin to take a general View of them?
No, I have not.

Have you been in the habit of attending the Model School in Dublin?
I could scarcely call it a Habit; I have been there pretty often.

How often do you suppose?
I do not think I have been there more than from Twenty to Thirty Times.

Upon those Occasions did you attend the Model School for Instruction?
I have made Education a good deal my own Pursuit and Study, and I will confess I thought I was perfectly competent, having been so long employed in Education, and having read a good deal upon the Subject, not only as it is conducted in this Country but as it is carried on in Germany, I did not think that I required training at the Model School.

The Question of course has no reference to your Ability to teach, or your general Knowledge of Education, but it has relation to a Knowledge of the particular System required by the Board. The Question is therefore proposed again; did you attend the Model School?
My Visits were with a view to observe the practical working of the Model School, certainly.

You being aware that that is Part of the Instructions given to you as an Inspector?
Yes, perfectly aware.

And you think you did enough to comply with that Direction?
I do with great Respect say, that a Person who has made Education a good deal his Study, who has devoted many Years to it practically, and who has extended his Views beyond the ordinary Course of Education, could in Twenty Visits be able to glean enough of the System of elementary Education in the Model School to enable him to comply with the Rules of the Board, and to see that that System in our Schools was carried out in the Spirit of the Model School.

The Question is, whether you consider yourself as satisfying this Direction of the Board which will now be read. "When Inspectors are in Dublin they will be expected to attend the Model School, or any other School that may be pointed out to them, for the Purpose of making themselves perfectly acquainted with the System of Teaching pursued by the Head Master, and also of aiding and introducing Improvements into Schools in the Metropolis, as the Commissioners are anxious that all Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity may be such as will fit them for becoming Model Schools for the rest of the Kingdom. They are directed to pay particular Attention to the Instructions and Suggestions of the Head Master"?
As to attending constantly there, if the Rules bind me, as they seem to imply, to attend constantly, so far I deviated from the Instructions of the Commissioners. But if any Noble Lord wishes to see whether I understand the System as in Practice in the Model School, I shall be at any Time ready to satisfy him that I am perfectly competent to show that I understand the System of Education as conducted in the Model School.

Assuring you that there is no Intention of impeaching your Knowledge of the System, you are requested to state whether you have done this for the Purpose of "aiding and introducing Improvements into Schools" in Dublin?
If my Opinion as to the Introduction of Improvements were not asked I do confess that I would consider it something beyond my Duty to suggest any Improvements in the Model School, and I did not take the Liberty of suggesting any Improvements.

The

T. Finn, LL.D.

The Question is as to attending the Model School for the Purpose of "aiding and introducing Improvements" in the other Schools of Dublin?
I have not visited the Schools in Dublin. The Fact is we are kept the greater Portion of the Year on Duty, and we have very little Time indeed to visit those Schools in Dublin.

Were you ever in the Richmond Street Schools?
Never; I went there once for the Purpose of going into it; it was during the Vacation.

Then it was closed?
It was.

Before it became a School on the List of the National Board, had you ever been into it?
Never.

Do you know when it was built?
No, I do not.

Do you recollect whether it was built by the Catholic Association about Ten Years ago?
I could not say; I have no Recollection of it.

Do you know whether it is or is not the Residence of Mr. Rice, the Superior of the Christian Brothers Society?
I do not. I have no Knowledge of the working of that School whatever.

Nor who are resident there?
No.

Nor who are the Teachers there?
No.

Do you know any thing, in fact, of the Society of Christian Brothers?
I do not know any thing of them, otherwise than if they should happen to come in my Way officially; I mean, if they should happen to be Teachers of our Schools anywhere.

Have you, in fact, found them Teachers anywhere?
I do not well understand the Distinction between Monks and those Christian Brethren. I have found Monks in some of the Schools under my Inspection?

But you do not know whether you ever found any Christian Brethren?
I do not, as contradistinguished from Monks.

Do you know the Work now shown to you; a Roman Catholic Directory published in Dublin? (*The same being shown to the Witness.*)
I have seen Books of which this appears to be a Copy.

According to the Appearance of it, and according to the Title Page of it, should you, or not, expect that it would be a Book upon which primâ facie one might take the Facts to be as stated in it?
I should certainly consider a Work emanating from that Quarter to be authentic.

Emanating from what Quarter?
From the Quarter which the Title shows. I wish to see the Printer's Name. There is no Printer's Name upon this, so far as I can see, which might guide me in saying whether this emanated from the Office of a Printer who had received the Sanction of the Roman Catholic Priesthood of Ireland.

Have the goodness to look at the List of Books at the End of the Volume, which are said to be published by the Roman Catholic Book Society. Will you state whether you know that there is such Society, with such Officers?
There is.

Is that the Society which has published Catholic Books, some of which have been accepted by the Board, and allowed to be used at the Time of general Instruction?
I am not acquainted with the Fact, whether it is that Society or another Society.

T. Finn, LL.D.

Do you know whether the Gentlemen whose Names are there are Officers of the Society which you spoke of before?
I do not know.

Was it Part of your Business to ascertain what Books were used in the Schools at the Time of separate Religious Instruction?
I deemed it no Portion of my Duty to inquire what Books of separate Religious Instruction were used by the several Denominations at the Time set apart for Religious Instruction. I never reported it.

Did the Board ever instruct you to inquire what Books were so used?
I have no Recollection of getting any Instructions to that Effect; that is to say, what Books during the Time of separate Religious Instruction each Religious Communion used.

Have the Goodness to read the Fourth Regulation, and say how you complied with that Regulation?
"They will require to have the entire Control over all Books to be used in the Schools, whether in the combined Literary or separate Religious Instruction; none to be employed in the first except under the Sanction of the Board, nor in the latter but with the Approbation of the Members of the Board of the Persuasion of those for whose Use they are intended."

Did you ever take any Step to see that that Regulation was observed?
No; my Reading of it was, that Persons upon making Application were to subscribe to certain Conditions upon which alone Aid was to be granted, and that that was a Portion of the Conditions they were required to subscribe to, before any Aid could be given. And I considered that this had Reference to Schools in the first instance making Application.

Are the Committee to understand, that so far as it has come to your Knowledge the Board gave no Instruction to Inspectors to inquire into the Books used in separate Religious Instruction?
As well as my Memory serves me, I have no Recollection of any positive Injunction imposed upon me to make such Inquiry.

Do you recollect whether any Instruction whatever of the Wish of the Board was given to you to see that that Regulation was carried into effect?
I have no Recollection of any such Intimation.

Have you any regular Form drawn out by Order of the Board to guide you in your Examination of Schools?
There are printed Forms for our Reports. There are a certain Number of Queries, and we answer those Queries, and the Answers to the Queries embody all that we think necessary for the Board to know, or all that we think ourselves in Duty bound to impart.

Have you had Occasion to inquire or ascertain where the Masters of the different Schools you have visited had been trained?
It is a Portion of the Report; there is a Query to that Effect; it is my Business to answer that Query.

In making that Observation have you had Occasion to observe whether the Schoolmasters that have been trained at the Model School at Dublin are more efficiently trained and fitted for the Exercise of their Duty than other Masters?
As far as my Experience reaches, they are decidedly so.

As compared with other Masters in general?
Decidedly so.

Have you been acquainted with Schools under Masters that have been trained by the Kildare Place Society?
Yes, a great Number.

How did you find the Masters trained?
I would say in point of Literary Qualification, as a Body, they were, if not grossly deficient, yet they were in a literary point of view very deficient as Teachers.

T. Finn, LL.D.

You think them more deficient than those who have been trained in the Model School of the Board?
I do. As a Sample of it, I have known many Instances in which those Masters were not able to spell correctly the Names of the Children on the Class Lists.

Do you mean the Christian Names or the Surnames of the Children?
I think the Christian Names more than the Surnames.

Should you think it very remarkable that they were not able to spell the Surnames very accurately of all the Children that come to the School?
I would indeed, being familiar with them.

In the Return of the Board there is the Name of Shanganaghmore, and there is put immediately afterwards "Duplicate;" are there Two Shanganaghmore Schools in Queen's County?
At present I do not remember.

When you were elected Inspector was there any Competition or Examination of the Candidates?
I can only speak of myself as regards an Examination. Some of the Commissioners were acquainted with my Literary Character. Dr. Sadleir was; I was in College in his Time; and Dr. Murray knew it, and I believe Mr. Blake knew it. Mr. Carlile knew it distinctly, and I believe they were all perfectly satisfied with my perfect Literary Competency.

Do you know how many Candidates there were at the Time of your Election?
From the Appearance of the Number present, I should imagine there were Sixty or Seventy Candidates.

Beyond your Literary Character, were you known to many of the Board?
I had been a resident Master in Trinity College for Two Years myself, during which Time, as well as during my Undergraduate Course, Dr. Sadleir of course had an Opportunity of knowing me. Dr. Murray I had the Honour of knowing a little, but to the others I was a perfect Stranger, except in point of Literary Character.

You have said that you were known to Dr. Sadleir as a resident Master of Arts; were you of Trinity College?
Yes.

Were you on the Foundation of Trinity College?
To be a resident Master in Trinity College after a certain standing, and performing certain Literary Exercises, and Payment of Fees, becomes Matter of course, if he wishes to continue in College after taking a Master's Degree. He has certain Duties imposed upon him. Examining at the quarterly Examinations is one. It is not necessary that he should be on the Foundation.

In point of fact were you ever on the Foundation of Trinity College?
I was, but not as a Master.

Were you a Scholar?
I was.

Then at that Time you were not a Roman Catholic?
No.

You entered Trinity College, then, a Protestant?
I did.

During the Time of your Residence in Trinity College as a Scholar you continued to be a Protestant?
I did.

You received the Communion?
Once as a Qualification for Scholarship.

T. Finn, LL.D.

And you continued to attend Chapel, and go through all the special Observances of a Protestant, and to profess Protestantism, during the whole Time in which you were a Scholar?

I did, so far as attending Chapel and going once to the Communion; those were the special Duties in that respect.

But you were a Protestant of the Church of England at that Time?
I was.

When did you cease to be a Protestant?
Upon my leaving College.

Immediately?
Immediately.

When did you declare yourself a Roman Catholic?
Upon my leaving College I became a Roman Catholic. But if your Lordships will allow me to observe, that I am married to the Daughter of a Protestant Clergyman, and that she continues to be a Protestant from the Time of her Marriage to this.

When did you cease to be a Protestant; did you continue a Protestant after your Scholarship expired?
Yes.

How long?
I suppose for Two Years; till I had retired from the College, for I was Nine Years altogether in College.

So long as you resided in College you were a Protestant?
I was.

But as soon as you left College you were a Roman Catholic?
Just so.

Before you went to College were you a Roman Catholic?
I was.

Did you begin being a Protestant when you went to College?
Yes.

Did you ever take any strong Political Part so lately as the Year 1830?
I have no Recollection of it.

Is your Name Thomas Finn, Doctor of Laws?
Yes.

Did you ever authorize an Advertisement appearing in the Morning Register of Wednesday the 29th December 1830, to this Purport:—"We the undersigned request a Public Meeting of the Literary Teachers of the City of Dublin on Saturday the 1st of January at the Hour of Twelve o'Clock, at the Arena, Lower Abbey Street, to petition both Houses of Parliament for a Repeal of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland," signed by "T. Finn," at the Head of Forty-seven other Schoolmasters.

I remember that distinctly, but I thought it was not so late as 1830.

You remember the Fact?
I remember the Fact, but I was not at the Meeting, nor did I attend any Political Meeting of any Kind since 1829.

Do you recollect in the Morning Register of the 16th March 1833 to have seen an Advertisement to this Effect: "At a Meeting of the Parishioners of St. Mary's, held at the Arena on Wednesday the 13th Instant, for the Purpose of petitioning Parliament against the Grey Gagging Bill, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted. Dr. Finn in the Chair; John R. Phayre, Secretary." The Third Resolution is in these Words: "Proposed by Mr. C. Coyne, seconded by Mr. Walter Burke, Resolved, That the Ministry having forfeited the Confidence of the Irish People by the Advocacy of the Grey

Dudgeon Bill, we call upon our City Representatives to refuse their Consent to all the Supplies which may come before the House after the passing of that atrocious Measure." Signed "—— Finn, Chairman"? *T. Finn, LL.D.*

I have no Recollection of that.

Have you any Doubt that you are not the Person there designated?
I have no Recollection of attending any Political Meeting since 1829.

Is your Name a very common one?
Very common; there are a great Number of my Name.

Are there many Dr. Finns in Dublin?
There are, I think, Two.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Two o'Clock.

Die Veneris, 19° *Maii* 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

ROBERT SULLIVAN, M.A., is called in, and examined as follows:

You are an Inspector under the Board of Education in Ireland?
I am.

How long have you been an Inspector?
Since May 1832.

In what District have you acted chiefly?
Principally in Ulster, and particularly in the Counties of Antrim and Down. In 1832 I set out, having the whole Province of Ulster to inspect; in 1833 I had Six Counties of it (the Schools having extended); in 1834 I had but Antrim and Down; in 1835, in addition to Antrim and Down, I took Armagh to assist another Inspector; in 1836 I inspected in Leinster Five Counties, Louth, Meath, Westmeath, King's County, and Longford; and occasionally I have been sent to inspect specially in other Counties not in my District, as in Galway, Queen's County, &c.

Did you visit a School in Down called Annabilt?
I did.

Were there any particular Circumstances connected with that School?
An Application had been made (I think in the Year 1832, before the Inspectors were appointed,) through the Government of the Day, to the Commissioners for Aid to that School. Having found it entered on my Road-book, with a Grant of 20*l.* a Year Salary, I proceeded to the School, and discovered that it had been placed under the Board without the Approbation and Knowledge of the Persons properly authorized; though the Application was signed by the Presbyterian Minister of the District, the Rev. Samuel Crory, and by a Person who annexed to his Name M.D.; his Name I think was Rutherford. I recollect reporting to the Board the Fact, and also that the School had no Claims upon the Funds intrusted to them, inasmuch as it was well endowed. The Board struck it off their List on Receipt of my Report. No Salary had been paid.

Were you Inspector of the North at the Time that some Complaints were brought forward by a Gentleman of the Name of M'Clelland against the National Schools?
I was.

Can you state what was the Nature of those Complaints made by him?
The general Belief was, and such is mine, that he commenced his Agitation in consequence of some Proceedings that took place at a General Meeting of the Synod of Ulster in Derry in the Year 1834. There was a warm and protracted Discussion at that Meeting on the Subject of National Education, and the Question having been put to the Vote, there was a Majority of Ministers in favour of a Resolution which would have had the Effect of connecting the School with the Board. Sixty-two Ministers and Twelve Elders voted in favour of the Resolution, but Fifty-six Ministers and Twenty-four Elders voted against it, so that the Question was lost by a Majority of Six Elders. Immediately after that Mr. M'Clelland commenced a System of Agitation against the Schools in the North; and his Object seems to have been, and I have so stated it in my Report of Laymore National School, to deter his Brother Ministers from coming to a Vote in favour of the National System at the next General Meeting of Synod in Belfast.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Who is he?
He is a Clergyman in Connexion with the Synod of Ulster.

You say a System of Agitation; what do you mean?
Mr. M'Clelland lives in the Parish of Ahoghill in the Vicinity of Ballymena; he agitated from that to Derry and from Derry to Bunbridge (Magherhalts).

When you say he agitated what do you mean?
He published Placards, and at the Head of assembled Multitudes (he himself described One of his Processions as amounting to upwards of 5,000 Persons) proceeded to our Schools. I have Copies of some of his Placards.

Will you read the Placard?
I should observe that this is not his first Placard; he issued one before, in which he stated that he had emancipated, as he called it, several of the National Schools. This he effected by turning the Children out of the Schools, and by taking down the Boards on which the Words "National School" were painted. This Placard was headed "Religious Procession." "The Friends of the Holy Bible and true Christian Principles are requested to attend Public Worship in the Green of the Presbyterian Meeting House of the Rev. George M'Clelland, Ahoghill, on the Morning of Wednesday next the 24th instant, at the Hour of Nine o'Clock precisely. The Parents and Children connected with the Schools in the following Districts, which have been emancipated from the prayerless and unscriptural System of the new Board of National Education, will be in attendance; viz. Bridge End, Galgorm, Tullygarley, Laymore, Chirty Grange, Tannybrake, and Ballyeaston; to these also shall be joined the Ahoghill, Largy, Ferrygowan, Cloughouge, Moyasset, and Cullybackey Holy Bible Schools, in which the Word of God has never been imprisoned. At Ten o'Clock the Procession will be arranged, and will proceed forthwith to Ballymena in due Order, and will attend a Meeting of Presbytery to be held in the old Presbyterian Meeting House in that Town at Twelve o'Clock Noon, for the Purpose of trying the Trustees of Guy's Free School for excluding the Holy Bible from that Place on Week Days, and for preventing Children from reading either the Old or New Testament on the Lord's Day in that House. The amateur Bands of Connor and Ballymena will accompany the Procession, and the opening of the Meeting will be announced by the Sound of the Trumpet. All are requested to observe secret and family Worship before leaving their Homes, and after they return. It is also requested that they be supplied with Pocket Bibles, and that they drink no distilled Spirits during the Day. Each School shall be supplied with a painted Board marked Holy Bible School, to be carried on a Pole in the Procession, and to be afterwards put up on their respective Schoolhouses, and to be preserved for a similar Procession on the 24th Day of September 1835. The Rev. George M'Clelland proposes to preach against the new System of National Education in the above Meeting House at Five o'Clock on the Evening of Sunday next the 21st instant, and the Rev. W. Wauchope may preach Two Sermons in favour of it on the Morning of that Day, and thus the People will be prepared to form their own Decision. The Rev. Alex. Patterson may also preach Two Sermons in favour of it on Sabbath next, as the Rev. W. K. M'Kay will preach against it on the Evening of Tuesday the 23d instant, in the new Presbyterian Meeting House. (Signed) George M'Clelland. 19th September 1832." In another Placard, dated the 25th of the same Month, Mr. M'Clelland refers to the Procession which took place in consequence of this Manifesto, in the following Words: "*N.B.* A religious legal Procession of above 5,000 Friends of the Bible proceeded from Ahoghill to Ballymena on Wednesday last, for the Purpose of returning Thanks to the gracious Lord for the Deliverance of His Holy Word from false Confinement in Nine or Ten emancipated National Schools in these Districts. Public Worship was devoutly observed by the immense and respectable Congregation in a Field near Ballymena." That is a Copy of One of his Placards; I have several others in Print.

Is Mr. M'Clelland a Parochial Clergyman?
He is a Presbyterian Minister, a Member of the Synod of Ulster. He was brought before the Synod at the next General Meeting by some of his Brother Ministers, whose Pulpits he had taken forcible Possession of, and was defended by Dr. Cook, as far as Dr. Cook could defend him without identifying

6119

R. Sullivan, M.A.

himself with his Proceedings; and he was left in a Minority of 42 to 133 on a Question bearing on the Point. I was present during the Debate.

When you say that he emancipated the Schools by turning the Children out, what do you mean?

I remember stating in One of my Reports that One of the Schools that I visited had all the Appearance of having stood a Siege; that the Board had been taken down and the Windows injured, and that Crosses and P.s, for Popery, were painted on the Doors and Windows. The Master stated that Mr. M'Clelland, at the Head of several Thousands of Persons, had come there and had used Threats; indeed I recollect, although I did not state it in my Report, that some of them threatened to make Soup of him if he did not give up the School; and at another School in that Neighbourhood, Tannybrake, the Master sent up an Affidavit which describes Mr. M'Clelland as coming into the School and dismissing the Children, and taking down the Board upon which the Words "National School" were painted, which he endeavoured to break; but finding that he could not, he (Mr. M'Clelland) went into a neighbouring House and asked for an Axe or a Hatchet, which having obtained, he cut up the Board and put it into the Fire, and having asked for a Pair of Bellows, he (Mr. M'Clelland) blew up the Fire till the Fragments of it were consumed.

Were there any Circumstances connected with those particular Schools that excited the Disapprobation of Mr. M'Clelland beyond their being Schools under the National Board?

Those Schools were previously Kildare Place Schools; they are Protestant Schools; I mean the District is Protestant, and at least Two Thirds of the Children attending them are either Protestant or Presbyterian. The Master of the School I speak of is a Protestant, a most respectable young Man; he was a Teacher under the Kildare Place Society, and one of their best.

Were those Schools then under the National Board?

They were at the Time I speak of; but they had been previously under the Kildare Place Society. This Master had received a Silver Medal from the Kildare Place Society for the Superiority of his School.

Had the Schoolhouse been built with the Funds of the Kildare Place Society?

I am not sure of that; it is on the Property of Captain Miller, a Magistrate, the Manager of the School. The Master was also waylaid and assaulted by Persons alleged to be Orangemen.

In what Year was that?

In the Autumn of 1834.

Do you know this of your own Knowledge?

I was in the District at the Time and heard it from the Master and others; I have no Doubt of the Fact.

Are you sure they were Orangemen?

I was informed that the Person who assaulted the Schoolmaster was convicted before the Magistrates at Quarter Sessions for the Offence, and sentenced to One Month's Confinement and hard Labour; and that had it not been for the Intercession of the Master, he would have been sentenced to Six Months. He was alleged to be an Orangeman.

Whose Property was the Schoolhouse?

Captain Miller's; he is the Manager of the School. I should think the Schoolhouse was built principally at the Expense of Captain Miller.

Where is this Place?

In the County of Antrim, about Five Miles from Ballymena in the Parish of Connor.

Are there many Kildare Place Schools in that Part of the County that have been transferred to the Board of Education?

We have at present Ninety-six in those Two Counties alone. There have been

R. Sullivan, M.A.

been many more Applications in behalf of the Kildare Place Schools since the Year 1834, but the Funds having failed the Board have not been able to receive them into Connexion.

Of those Ninety-six were there many that had been Kildare Place Schools?
All of them.

Can you state whether the Number of Children increased, or whether the Proportion of Catholic and Protestant Children varied, after the Time of their being so transferred from the Kildare Place Society to the Board?
I cannot state the Proportion of the different Denominations of Children, for I made no Inquiry on that Point till last Year; but I believe that these Schools have increased since they became National. From their last published Report in the Year 1832, in which they give an Account of each Individual School, I have taken those Ninety-six Schools with the Number of Pupils annexed to each, and having added all the Numbers together, I found the Average per School to be Ninety-three; whereas the Average of these same Ninety-six Schools under the Board at the End of the Half Year ending 30th of September 1836 is 104.

That is in the County of Antrim?
And Down. I took their own Account of the Number of Pupils at these Ninety-six Schools.

But you have not taken the comparative Numbers of each Religious Faith?
We had no official Inquiries to make to that Effect, but I believe that Two Thirds at least of the Children in attendance at those Schools are either Protestant or Presbyterian.

As Inspector do you receive any Instructions with regard to an Inquiry upon that Point?
Not as Inspector officially. There was an Inquiry at the Instance of Mr. Carlile, but that Direction was not given till late in the Spring of the Year 1836; that was after my Inspection in the North; I left that District at the End of the Year 1835.

Are you a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?
I am a Protestant of the Established Church.

In the Schools which you have had an Opportunity of examining, which were Kildare Place Schools, but are now under the Board, were the Scriptures more read at the Time they were under the Kildare Place Society than they are now?
I believe them to be better read and more frequently read now. They were read before in these Schools as Books. The Rule as to the Frequency of reading them varied in different Schools, but generally, I believe, the Scriptures were read Three Times a Week in these Schools while under the Kildare Place Society; and they are now read in those Schools, as National, an Hour at least every Day, and in some of them Two Hours every Day as a Religious Exercise. Under the Kildare Place Society the Scriptures were read as School Books, though they did not wish them to be used as such.

What were the Books that were read in those Schools under the Kildare Place Society generally before they came under the National Board?
The Dublin Spelling Book, the Dublin Reading Book, and Extracts from the Scriptures were their Class Books, (they did not supply the Scriptures to their Schools;) also Abridgments of Natural History and Travels, which they called Library Books.

Did they not at any Time supply Bibles?
Never.

Were you rightly understood, that the Scriptures are more read in those Schools that were formerly under the Kildare Place Society, but now under the Board, than they were when the Schools were under the Kildare Place Society?
I believe it.

691

R. Sullivan, M.A.

What Opportunity have you of knowing the Practice of those Schools under the Kildare Place Society?

I have stated that I understood the general Practice in those Schools was this, that the Scriptures were read Three Times a Week, and, in point of fact, as a School Book.

Have you any personal Knowledge upon the Subject?

I cannot speak of the Practice of the Kildare Place Society Schools generally; I can only speak of the Kildare Place Schools that I have inspected as National, and I know the Rule and Practice is, that the Scriptures are read every Day in them for an Hour as a Religious Exercise.

You are speaking of those Two Counties?

I am speaking of Presbyterian and Protestant Schools; I mean under the Management of Protestants or Presbyterians.

You are speaking of Schools under the Board?

Yes.

When you say Protestant Schools under the Board, you recognise the Distinction of Roman Catholic Schools and Protestant Schools?

No, I do not; but I know it to be a Fact that in many Districts the Schools consist of Protestant Children, and that the Managers have a Wish that the Scriptures should be read.

When you said, in a former Answer, that such a School is a Protestant School, was this your Meaning, that the Majority of the Children are Protestant?

Just so. I was speaking with regard to the Kildare Place Schools now under the Board. I was asked if the Bible was as much read in those Schools, now that they were National, as it had been formerly read while they were in connexion with the Kildare Place Society, and I stated that I believed it to be more read and better read now than before; for it is read in those Schools, to my own Knowledge, One Hour every Day at least, and better read; I mean by that, that it is read as a Religious Exercise, and not as formerly as a School-book; as which in too many Instances I have found it tossed about the Desk, and the Leaves of it trampled under the Feet of the Children.

What Counties are you principally speaking of now?

Down and Antrim.

Had you inspected any Schools in those Counties when they were under the Kildare Place Society?

I had not.

Then what Knowledge had you of what took place under the Kildare Place Society?

I understood that the Scriptures were read generally about Three Times a Week in the Kildare Place Schools as School-books by all the Children competent.

Then the Comparison you make is between the present reading of the Scriptures founded upon your own Observation in the National Schools, as compared with the reading of the Scriptures as you have collected it from Report in the Kildare Place Schools?

Exactly.

But you considered it to be one of the Rules of the Kildare Place Society that the Bible should be read Three Times a Week?

No; they state that their Rule is, that all the Children who have attained a suitable Proficiency are to read it; but they do not specify, at least in their original and fundamental Rules, how often it is to be read. In the Year 1832, subsequent to the Establishment of the Board, they directed their Teachers to have the Scriptures read daily in the Schools, and to enter the Portion read in the Report Book. Then I went to the Practice, which I learned by asking the Kildare Place Masters now under the Board; I have inquired from them how often the Scriptures were read in these Schools while under the Kildare Place Society, and ascertained from them that their general Practice was to have them read Three Times a Week; and then I stated to your Lordships that the

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Scriptures are read in those same Schools, since they became National, once every Day, but with this Distinction, that they are read after the Literary Business terminates, and as a Religious Exercise.

And not as Part of the Business of the School?
Not as Part of the Literary Business, but as a Religious Exercise, in which those Pupils only are required to join whose Parents approve of it.

Before whom are the Scriptures read?
The Master generally, in the Absence of the Pastor or Clergyman.

And that is according to the Rules of the National Board?
It is; because in the Instructions which the Board gave in the Year 1832 to the Inspectors (a Copy of which was returned to your Lordships House at that Time) they were told that after the Literary Business was over every Facility was to be given to the Introduction of the Scriptures, and to the Explanation of them either by the Pastor or by Persons approved of by the Parents.

You spoke of a great Number of Schools that you call Protestant Schools; have you seen any Return procured by Mr. Carlile relative to the respective Numbers of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in the Schools in Ireland?
I should not have described them as Protestant Schools; my Meaning was that in Protestant Districts I knew from my own Knowledge that the Children attending the Schools were with few Exceptions Protestant.

Are you aware in fact of the Returns that were made to Mr. Carlile, and which he has made to this House, respecting the Number of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children severally in the Schools of Antrim and Down?
No; I was inspecting in that Year in Leinster.

Are you aware that there are 102 Schools in the County of Antrim?
I am aware of that.

From your Knowledge of the State of Protestantism, and of the State of the Schools in that District, should you be surprised to find that out of those 102 Schools in the County of Antrim there are Twenty-seven which are absolutely exclusive, being confined to Children of One Denomination?
It would not; for though Antrim is the most Protestant County in Ireland, I know there are Districts in it that are inhabited solely by Roman Catholics; and I know that the Board have established Schools in such Districts where the Kildare Place Society failed to carry Education.

Would you be surprised to hear that in the Majority of Schools in the County of Antrim, in the Proportion of Sixty-nine out of 102, those Schools are exclusively on one Side or the other?
I can only answer that there are Schools which from the District must be Protestant, and others that must be Roman Catholic; that is, that there are no or few Children of a different Denomination to attend.

Should you be surprsied to be told that from the Return made it appears that there are Sixty-three Schools in the County of Down?
I believe there are.

If you were told that in this Return sent to this House by Mr. Carlile it appears that there are Fourteen of those that are exclusively Protestant Schools, Two exclusively Roman Catholic, and that Twenty-eight had not more than an Average of Four Children of One Denomination in every School; would you, from your general Knowledge of the State of Things in that County, be surprised?
I should be surprised to hear that there was One exclusive School, either Protestant or Roman Catholic, under the Board; there is no such Thing as far as I know.

The Question did not mean exclusive in Form and Constitution, but in point of fact Two Schools having no Protestant Child and Twelve having no Roman Catholic Child; would it surprise you to be told that in the Male School at Newry there are 240 Roman Catholics and only Three Protestants?
No.

Did you ever consider it Part of your Duty to ascertain the Proportions of Roman Catholics or Protestants in the Schools?
No.

Were you not desired to do so by Mr. Carlile?
Not officially, but merely as Information for Mr. Carlile, and not till last Year.

And not in this District?
No.

Do you know the District of Creighton's Green and Ballygraney?
I do; these Schools are in my native Parish.

It is stated that there are no Roman Catholics in those Schools?
I am not surprised at that; there are very few Roman Catholics in the Parish.

Have you ever known of any National Schoolmaster under the Board attending any Political Meetings or Processions?
I recollect a Circumstance of this Kind; I think it was in the Beginning of the Year 1833, after I returned from my First Tour of Inspection. I happened to see in a Newspaper the Name of a Schoolmaster who had attended as Secretary to a Political Meeting; I think it was called the Volunteer Society. There had been a Meeting for the Formation of a Society to be denominated the Volunteers, and the Name of the Person who it was stated acted as Secretary I suspected to be a Teacher of one of the National Schools.

What was the Volunteer Society; was it a Political Society?
It was.

Did you take any Step upon that as Inspector?
I did; I sent the Newspaper with a Letter to the Board (it was in the Winter, during the Vacation), in which I stated that I suspected that the Person who acted as Secretary was the Teacher of a National School in Newry, and that it might be well to have a Letter addressed to the Managers to ascertain the Fact.

Was he a Roman Catholic?
He was; he admitted that he was the Person, and expressed his Sorrow and Contrition for having attended the Meeting. He was reprimanded by the Board, and I believe he would have been dismissed had I not informed them that he was a very respectable Man and an efficient Teacher.

What was his Name?
O'Gorman. This was before the Prohibition of the Board was issued.

What Part of Newry is this in?
In Chapel Street; in the old Part of the Town.

Have you any Reason to suppose that he has ever attended any Political Meeting since?
Not since.

What Prohibition of the Board do you refer to?
A Circular Letter which was addressed to the Managers of all Schools, stating that the Board would not allow any of their Teachers to attend Political Meetings, nor to connect themselves at all with Politics. This Occurrence was previous to the issuing of the Circular.

Who are the Visitors of that School?
The Person is since dead who corresponded at that Time; his Name was Mr. Trainor.

Who is the present Correspondent?
It is under a Committee. I have not been there since 1835. After the Prohibition referred to, I knew of Two other Instances. I heard that Two of our Schoolmasters had in the Year 1835 joined in an Orange Procession; they were themselves Orangemen. It was not in my District, but having heard it I thought it my Duty to communicate the Fact to the Board. I learned that the Inspector of the District had previously communicated the Fact; and that these

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Two Schoolmasters who had joined the Orange Procession in the County of Tyrone were reprimanded by the Board, but not dismissed, having expressed Contrition also. Those are the only Three Instances in which I have ever known of any of our Teachers connecting themselves with Political Matters.

Were they dismissed?
No; but they were reprimanded.

Have you visited another large School in the Town of Newry?
I did; in High Street.

When you went on your first Tour of Inspection were you directed to take any Steps to induce the Managers of existing Schools to place them under the Board?
No.

As your District was in Ulster, where Protestants are most numerous, were you desired there to take any Steps to induce the Protestants especially to place the Schools under the Board?
No.

Did you find in Ulster great Eagerness on the Part of the Protestants to have the reading of the Scriptures made a Part of the Business of the School?
I found that there was a very great Prejudice existing on the Part of the People. They were all naturally anxious, and I was glad to see it, that the Scriptures should be read in the Schools. I explained to them that there was nothing in the System which prohibited the reading of the Scriptures, and that I would be very glad to show them how they should be practically read an Hour or Two Hours every Day.

You took that Course to satisfy them that they might substantially gratify their Eagerness, and yet connect themselves with the Board?
I did. It was a Matter of Conscience with me. I wished the Scriptures to be read in the Schools.

What was the Course that you recommended; was it one that seemed to you strictly conformable to the Rules of the Board, and to the Instructions which, as Inspector, you had received?
Strictly. The People were surprised at my telling them that the Scriptures might be read in the Schools at all. I told them that I would write out a Notice for the particular School, which I did for almost all of them, stating that this particular National School was open every Day in the Week for general or Literary Instruction, from such an Hour to such an Hour, say from Ten to Two o'Clock, except Saturday; that all the Children were expected to attend from Ten to Two for Five Days in the Week, and that Saturday was set apart for Religious Instruction or Scripture Reading, and that there would also be a Scripture Class every Day, in the School, from Two to Three or from Nine to Ten. This Notice was put up in several of our Schools, and the System spread in consequence.

Then you in fact limited your Instructions to them as to the Practicability of having Scripture Reading to a Time which either preceded or followed the Time appointed for general united Instruction?
I confined myself particularly to the Instructions given to the Inspectors; namely, that a certain Period of the Day was to be set apart for Literary and General Instruction, during which all the Children were to attend.

The Question is, whether you said that the Time that might be used for reading the Scriptures must either be before or after the Time appointed for general Literary Instruction?
I told them that there was a particular Period for General or Literary Instruction; that there was a Time for every Thing; that the Bible itself said that there was; that the Periods of Religious and Literary Instruction were to be separated, and that the Time devoted to Religious Instruction was to be mentioned in the Notice, leaving Four Hours for the Literary Instruction.

Were

695

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Were those Hours to be continuous?
I always understood so from my Instructions; I would have thought it a Violation if they were not.

You would have thought it a Violation of the Rules to tell them that they might have general Reading from Ten to Eleven; Scripture Reading, if they pleased, from Eleven to Twelve; and general Literary Instruction again from Twelve to Three, and not compelling the Children to attend from Eleven to Twelve?
Unless Four Hours were set apart consecutively for Literary Instruction I should have thought it a Violation.

Do you recollect ever having Occasion to communicate with a School in the County of Armagh in the Parish of Killevey?
I was Inspector for Ulster in the Year 1832, and as such I was in that County.

You have said that you always considered it essential that the Hours for Literary Instruction should be consecutive?
I think I did.

Will you look at the Paper now shown to you, and state whether that is your Handwriting? (*A Paper being shown to the Witness.*)
It is.

The same is delivered in and read, and is as follows:

"I have visited this School in consequence of an Application to the Commissioners of Education for Aid. I have left a Copy of the Rules and Regulations, and have only to add, that the Bible may be read in the School from Nine till Ten o'Clock, and from Two till Three, or longer, every Day in the Week, by all the Children whose Parents approve of it, besides the Day or Days set apart for Religious Instruction, on which the Bible may be read from Morning to Night. Should the Manager of this School insist upon the Bible being read during School Hours, the Board will permit it, provided due Notice be given of the Hour, and that those Children whose Parents may object to it be not compelled to join in the Class.
"P.S.—Should this School be taken into Connexion, I would recommend it to be placed under the Management of a local Committee. Should the Board make a Grant in aid of the Master's Salary he will of course lower his Terms to the Children of the Peasantry generally, and teach gratuitously, without Distinction, all Children recommended by the Patrons, the Committee, and their respective Pastors."

Do you wish to give any Explanation of that?
No.

To whom are these Observations addressed?
They are Observations placed upon the Register of the School; they have been cut out of the private Register of the School.

Was this an Invitation to them to come under the Board?
It was no Invitation; they had made Application to the Board previous to my Visit, and the School, I understood from the Master, had been attacked in consequence. The Master of the School is Clerk of the Church. This occurred in the Year 1832, a long Time back, and those are the Kind of Observations I have made in almost every School; and I am not ashamed of them. I have stated that the Scriptures might be read from Ten to Eleven, and the Literary Business from Eleven to Three, which leaves Four Hours; and I stated, that if there was any other Hour in which the Managers would wish to have the Scriptures read instead of from Ten to Eleven, that by putting up a Notice it might be from Two to Three, or any other Hour. But still I did not mean that there should not be Four consecutive Hours for Literary Instruction.

What you meant was merely that the Hour selected for the Scripture Reading should be such as was most convenient to all the Parties concerned?
Yes; that it might be after School, and not before, as I had stated; and afterwards I found it better, when there was but One Hour set apart for Scripture

R. Sullivan. M.A.

Reading, to recommend the Hour to be from Two to Three, after the School, because then all the Children were present.

But that in every Case there should be Four Hours consecutive Study?
Yes. I thought I had stated that in every Case.

It appears in this Paper that "should the Managers of this School insist upon the Bible being read during School Hours, the Board will permit it, provided due Notice be given of the Hour, and that those Children whose Parents may object to it be not compelled to join in the Class." How do you explain that Inconsistency with what you have said, that there were to be Four continuous Hours, and that the Scripture Reading was to be either after the School Hours or before?
I have made a Mistake in calling it School Hours; I meant that it might be from Two to Three, or after that Time. I had specified the Hour there from Ten to Eleven, and lest they should think that I was confining the Scriptures to that particular Hour I added the other; and my Expression is certainly inaccurate in calling it School Hours; I should have said after the Literary Business.

Will you look at that Paper, and see whether "during School Hours" is not specially scored, so as to show that it was emphatic?
It has that Appearance.

Do you remember having scored it yourself?
I could not say; it was in the Year 1832.

May it have been done by anybody else?
I cannot state that.

Does the Ink appear to be of the same Colour with the rest of it?
I think it does; I wrote it with the School Ink.

Do not the Words "School Hours" apply to the Hours occupied in Literary Business?
There is a Misunderstanding as to that Term. The School Hours may mean either all the Time that the School is open, or only the Hours of general Business.

Do not you consider that your Meaning was this, during the Time of united Instruction?
I should not have stated so if that is the Meaning put upon it.

Do not you believe that that was the Meaning you attached to it when you wrote that?
It has that Appearance; but I am so strong upon that Point that I do not recollect a Case in which I have ever deviated from that; I have always stated Four Hours at least for Literary and General Instruction, and the remaining Twenty, if they chose, for Religious Instruction.

You are more inclined to consider this as a mere Inaccuracy of Expression than to suppose that it meant a decided Deviation from your ordinary Rules in that Instance?
That is my Explanation; I was just setting out as Inspector at that Time.

Do you mean to say, that having seen that Paper you now believe it was merely an Inaccuracy, and that you did not mean to state that an Option should be given of having Scripture Reading during the Hours of united Education?
I do; I never meant that.

When do the Schools begin in the Morning?
The general Hours are from Ten to Two o'Clock.

Do you remember that in the course of your first Tour you had Occasion at some Schools to inquire the Reason of the very scanty Attendance of Scholars?
I have often observed that at Labour Seasons the rural Schools in general are almost empty.

69

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Do you recollect to have received this Answer, at any Time in the early Period of your Inspection, that they did not attend because they were so fond of the Bible; that they would not attend Schools where the Bible was not permitted to be read?

There was a general Feeling in the North at the Commencement, and it still partially exists, that the Scriptures were not permitted to be read; and I have no Doubt many Parents were deterred from sending their Children in consequence.

Do you recollect suggesting in a School that the Scholars might be suffered to read the Scriptures for One Month, and do nothing else, and that this would give them enough of it?

I do not recollect that.

Do you think it possible that you could have said that?

I do not recollect ever having said it.

Do you think it possible, in the Discharge of your Duty as Inspector, that you could ever have said so?

I do not think I did. Such a Feeling as would lead me to use such an Expression never existed in my Mind.

In Ulster, upon the whole, did you find that the System of the Board tended to exclusive rather than united Education?

No, I did not.

You think that upon the whole, in Ulster, the Tendency of the Board's System was to bring Protestants and Roman Catholics to the same School?

I think the Tendency of it is such; and in Practice, in a great measure, it has been so; but the natural Effects of the System have been partly prevented by the Opposition raised against it. If it had been fairly tried I have no Doubt that such would have been the Effects in general.

The Meaning of the Question was, whether the actual Effect of the System in the Province of Ulster was to bring Protestants and Roman Catholics together as Scholars in the same School?

I think the natural Effect of it was such. Against some particular Schools there has been powerful and persevering Opposition, and Parents have in consequence been induced to withdraw their Children from them.

The Question is, what has been the actual Effect?

I cannot speak of the actual Effect of the general System.

From your Experience as Inspector for Two Years in the Counties of Antrim and Down especially, have you any Opinion whether, in fact, in those Counties the National System did unite together the Roman Catholic and Protestant Scholars?

I have no Doubt that in those Ninety-six Schools that I mentioned which were under the Kildare Place Society in 1832 there are more Protestant Children in the Schools now than there were in 1832, and this might be easily ascertained by your Lordships; in the course of Ten Days Inquiry might be made.

The Question is, whether from your Experience as Inspector in the Counties of Down and Antrim you consider that the System had actually brought Protestants and Roman Catholics more together than otherwise?

I think it has; but there are Exceptions; there are particular Schools in which there may be found fewer Protestant Children than there were before, in consequence of the Parents being induced to withdraw them.

Then are you to be understood to say that from your Experience you are confident that the general Effect in the Counties of Antrim and Down was to bring Protestants and Roman Catholics together in the same Schools?

I can only speak as far as my Experience goes, and I state that in Ninety-six Schools, which are a large Portion of the National Schools in those Two Counties, I believe that there are more Protestant Children now than there were under the Kildare Place Society.

The Question applies to all the Schools that you have inspected in the Counties of Antrim and Down; looking to all those Schools are you of opinion that the

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Effect of the System of Education has been that stated in the preceding Question?

Except in some Schools, which I can particularize, from which some of the Parents have been obliged or induced to withdraw their Children.

Then is this your Meaning; that in general the actual Effect of the Board's System in the Counties of Antrim and Down, so far as your Experience goes, has been to bring Protestant and Roman Catholic Children together in the same Schools, but that some Exceptions have occurred of which you think you can give an Account?

I meant to say, in answer to Part of the Question, and the only Part that I can answer with Truth, according to my Experience, such has been the Effect, unless where there has been obvious Means taken to counteract that Effect.

Has that Effect been decidedly and uniformly the Case in all those Schools which you have had an Opportunity of observing, in which the Protestant Minister of the Parish has given his Aid and Countenance in the Establishment and Support of the School?

It has; wherever the Protestant Minister or Landlord, or any Person that could countenance and encourage the Schools, have done so, those Schools have been invariably so attended.

By both Parties?

Yes.

Do you confine that Answer to those Two Counties, or do you extend it generally over all Parts of the Kingdom which you have inspected?

I am speaking now of those Two Counties.

Have you found that the Case in any other Part of the Kingdom?

Yes. I have found in every Case in which the Landlord has encouraged the School it has been attended by the different Denominations freely. I could particularize certain Places in which the Landlords have established National Schools which are attended by all the different Denominations of Children in the Neighbourhood. I have now in my Mind an excellent School under the Patronage of Sir Thomas Chapman, and I can mention others.

Will you take the Statement now shown to you into your Hands, and see whether the Schools returned there as being under Protestant Clergymen have in all Cases Roman Catholic Children attending?

There are a few such Schools.

By Protestants do you mean Protestants of the Established Church?

I mean Protestants of the Established Church.

Will you look at Ballyrogan; that is under a Clergyman of the Presbytery of Antrim?

It is; the Rev. Hugh Moore.

What is the Number of Roman Catholics there, according to the Return now shown to you?

Two.

Supposing that Return is correct, can you reconcile that with what you have said, that wherever the Protestant Clergyman is favourable to the School you have found that the Roman Catholic Children and the Protestant Children come together?

That the Children come freely.

If this Return is correct would it agree with your Statement?

It would. The only Inquiry ever made as to the different Denominations of the Children attending Schools was by the Commissioners in 1825. I have now before my Eyes an Extract from that Parliamentary Report, in which this very School is returned by the Protestant Parochial Clergy in that Year as having on the Books of the School Sixty-two Presbyterians, Eight Protestants, and no Roman Catholics whatever. The District is Presbyterian, the Manager of the School is a Presbyterian, and almost all the Scholars are necessarily Presbyterian.

699

R. Sullivan, M.A.

On the Subject of separate Religious Instruction, you stated just now that the Religious Instruction in Protestant Schools in Antrim and Down went on regularly from Two to Three?
I have always recommended it to be so, and I have always found it so, so far as I recollect.

You have then interested yourself in the Inquiry of what was going on in the separate Religious Instruction in Protestant Schools?
I was very glad to know that the Scriptures were read after School, and I have pointed out to the People the Way in which they might be read in strict Conformity with the Rules of the Board.

Do not the Rules of the Board require that no Book should be read at the Time of Religious Instruction which was not either the Standard of the Church to which the School belonged, or which had not the Sanction and Approbation of some Member of the Board?
I understand that to be the Rule.

Then by that you have regulated yourself in this Branch of your Inspection of Schools?
The Board do not take Cognizance of that as a Board; it is only the particular Member who is of the same Religious Persuasion as the Child. We have nothing to do with the Books used in the separate Religious Instruction.

Then are the Committee to understand that you, as Inspector, never received Instructions from the Board to look at that Particular?
We are required in our Report to state the Names of all the Books we find in the School, by which is meant in School Hours, as it is supposed that we inspect only during the Period of General or Literary Instruction. If I found a peculiarly Religious Book in a School during this Period I would consider it my Duty to report that Fact to the Board, and to point out to the Managers the Violation.

Were you ever directed to inquire what Books were used at the Time of separate Religious Instruction?
I do not recollect having ever been so directed.

Is it in your Instructions?
I think not; it is not.

Have you seen the Letter of Lord Stanley to the Board, constituting them a Board?
I have.

Are you aware that in that Letter it is said that the Commissioners "will exercise the most entire Control over all Books to be used in the Schools, whether in the combined Literary or separate Religious Instruction; none to be employed in the first except under the Sanction of the Board, nor in the latter but with the Approbation of the Members of the Board of the Persuasion of those for whose Use they are intended"?
I recollect that.

Did you ever receive any Instructions to ascertain in your Inspection whether that was observed or not?
I do not recollect that I ever did.

Do you believe that you were ever directed to do that?
I do not think I was; I am quite sure I never was.

Did you in point of fact inquire in the Schools what Books were used at the Time of separate Religious Instruction?
I knew the Books that were so used. In the Protestant or Presbyterian Districts, where the Managers and the Majority of the Children are Presbyterians or Protestants, the Scriptures are read as a Religious Book, and in the Roman Catholic Districts the Children are instructed in their Catechism, and in a Book called the Christian Doctrine. Those are the only Books in general Use in these Schools, as far as I know.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Did you ever make Inquiry as Inspector what Books were used at the Time of separate Religious Instruction?
Never.

At the Time you were not actually on your Visitation in Dublin were you in the habit, particularly at first, of attending the Model School?
The Model School was not established when I was appointed; but I recollect that we were directed by the Board to visit with Dr. M'Arthur all the National Schools in Dublin and Vicinity. There were Four Inspectors appointed, and we went Three or Four Weeks with him to examine these Schools.

Who were those Four?
Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hamill, since dead, Mr. Murray, and myself.

How long ago was that?
In May and June 1832; nearly Five Years ago.

Have you visited the Schools since in Dublin?
I have; but not as Inspector.

Is not a Direction to visit those Schools when you are in Dublin Part of your general Instructions?
It is; but I cannot say that I went there in consequence of that. I always when I see a School go into it; and I have gone into several Schools in Dublin. I have been sent also specially to Two or Three in the County of Dublin.

Did you not feel yourself bound to obey that Part of your Instructions?
I attended for Three or Four Weeks in these Two Months I have mentioned with Dr. M'Arthur, and examined the Children in these Schools, and heard him examine them; I was besides very well acquainted with Education myself. The Model School in fact is not yet in complete Operation; I have frequently however gone into it.

The Question is respecting the other Schools in Dublin. You say that at one Time you went to see them with Dr. M'Arthur. The Regulation is that "When Inspectors are in Dublin they will be expected to attend the Model School, or any other School that may be pointed out to them, for the Purpose of making themselves perfectly acquainted with the System of teaching pursued by the Head Master, and also of aiding and introducing Improvements into Schools in the Metropolis, as the Commissioners are anxious that all Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity may be such as will fit them for becoming Model Schools for the rest of the Kingdom." Have you obeyed that Part of your Instructions?
I have in reality; inasmuch as I have made myself Master of Dr. M'Arthur's System of Instruction.

Have you obeyed it in respect of visiting those other Schools for the Purpose "of aiding and introducing Improvements into Schools in the Metropolis, as the Commissioners are anxious that all Schools in Dublin and its immediate Vicinity may be such as will fit them for becoming Model Schools for the rest of the Kingdom"?
Any such Schools as were pointed out to me I have visited; but we have never been able to do all the Schools in our own Districts; all our Time is occupied in different Parts of Ireland, and it is only in the Winter Months that we have Vacation.

The Question is, whether when you were in Dublin at that Time, according to the Direction here given, you did go to those Schools for that Purpose?
Not for that Purpose, when in Dublin.

Have you been given to understand by the Board that the Schools in Dublin were as yet in such a State of Forwardness, in respect of well-trained Masters and the Conduct of the Children, as to fit them for becoming proper Models for the rest of the Country?
Certainly not; I considered my Schools in the Country much superior in every respect.

701

R. Sullivan, M.A.

You consider the Dublin Schools, from what you have seen of them, very bad?

I do; I consider them, with few Exceptions, the worst Schools.

As compared with what?

As compared with many in the Counties of Antrim and Down, where Education has been going on so long under the Kildare Place Society, and which have had the Benefit of Superintendence and regular Inspection for Twenty Years. They are necessarily in better Order.

Do you find those Schools that were under the Kildare Place Society in much better Order than the Schools of the National Board in Dublin?

I found many of them much better; such as those on the Property of Noblemen or Gentlemen where the Teacher is well paid, that is, where he is supported by the Landlord in addition to what he receives from the Society; but in remote Districts, where the Teachers are badly paid, they are also badly qualified. In such Districts the Teachers do not receive more, in general, than 10*l.* or 15*l.* a Year, including the Grants or Gratuities from the Society.

Did you ever visit the Richmond Street School in Dublin?

Yes; but it is a long Time since. I have been in it, but not as Inspector.

Did you go into it when you visited the Schools with Dr. M'Arthur?

I do not recollect visiting that School with Dr. M'Arthur.

Have you been in it more than once?

I do not recollect; I think not.

Do you recollect that there were Two Boards over that School?

I have a very faint Recollection of the School.

Do you recollect there being a Board besides "National School," containing the Inscription "Model School"?

I have no Recollection of that Circumstance.

Were you ever in the King's Inn Street School?

I was. I inspected that School.

When?

I cannot state exactly; Two or Three Years ago.

How long has that School been established?

I cannot state exactly.

In what State did you find it?

I was pleased with the State of it.

Who were the Teachers of that School?

I do not recollect the Names.

Do you remember whether they were Nuns?

I do not recollect that. I should think not.

You know the Situation of the School?

Yes; and I recollect the Name of the Manager.

Who was the Manager?

The Lady who superintended it is Mrs. O'Brien of Mountjoy Square.

Do you know that the Correspondent of the School is the Rev. Mr. Woods?

I do not know that. I met Mrs. O'Brien there superintending the School, and as it was a Female School I thought it was under her Management.

It appears here that the Reverend P. Woods is the Correspondent of the King's Inn Street Male and Female and Infant Schools; do you recollect that there are Three Schools there?

I recollect that there is a School in King's Inn Street which I visited, and that if all I recollect beyond the favourable Impression produced upon my Mind by the efficient State in which I found it.

Do you happen to know that it immediately adjoins a Day School?

There is a Parochial School in that Neighbourhood; a Protestant School.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Very near?
I believe it is.

You know that Part of Dublin?
I have been living in Dublin for some Years, and I know the City generally.

Do you know whether the Part of Dublin in which the King's Inn Street School is situated is, generally speaking, well supplied with Schools, either of the National Board or of any other Board?
I cannot speak as to that, for Dublin not being in my District I have never given my Mind to such Inquiries there.

Do you upon further Recollection remember that any further Communication took place on the Subject of the Paper that was put in relating to the School when you wrote some Observations with regard to the Hours during which Scripture Reading might be carried on?
I have just recollected that a Presbyterian Minister, Mr. M'Gowan I think, inquired from the Secretary a short Time after the Occurrence if I was correct in the Observations I had written in the Report Book, and I have a Recollection that I was informed by the Secretary that I had made a Mistake in calling the Hour for Bible Reading a School Hour; that the Expression was inaccurate; and that if I had stated that the Scripture Reading might be carried on after the General or Literary Instruction as well as before it I should then have been correct; Mr. Kelly wrote to me to this Effect, I now recollect distinctly. This School is still applicant; that is endeavouring to get a Grant.

Has it not happened that there is a good deal of Dispute about the Meaning of the Words "School Hours"?
There is.

Had there at that Time been any Dispute about the Meaning of "School Hours"?
From the first, because some of the Presbyterian Ministers who took a prominent Part in opposing it insisted that the Scriptures should be read in School Hours. The Expression in the Regulations of the Board was that every Facility was to be afforded for the Introduction of the Scriptures after or before the ordinary School Hours.

Did those Presbyterian Ministers wish to adhere to the Kildare Place Rules?
They wished merely to have it called "in School Hours."

Knowing that there was generally such a Mistake, did not you yourself make it clearly known that there was such a Distinction intended to be made between what was meant between "School Hours" and "Hours"?
I knew the Distinction that must necessarily be made between General or Literary and Religious Instruction, and I took care that they should not be blended together, but that, in conformity with my Instructions, there should be a separate Time for each.

Then although there did exist a Mistake on the Part of the People generally, there was no Mistake in your own Mind with regard to what was meant by "School Hours"?
Certainly not. I always meant that there should be Four consecutive Hours for general Instruction.

Did you ever intend that it should be admitted as a Rule that the Bible should be read during the Time that all the Children were required to attend, on pain of their being punished?
Certainly not. There is, or should be, put up in every National School a Paper which is called "School Rules," in which the Day and the Hours appointed for Religious Instruction are notified; during which Periods those Children only whose Parents or Guardians approved of it are required to attend; but during the Period of General or Literary Instruction all the Children of the School are required to attend. By the School Hours I mean those Hours during which all the Pupils are required to be present, but many apply the Term to the entire Time during which the School is open either for

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Literary or Religious Instruction. The latter is the Sense in which many of the Opponents of the System used the Term.

What was your Occupation before you were appointed Inspector; had you turned your Attention to Education before?

I was educated partly in the Belfast Institution, and afterwards passed through Trinity College, in which I took the Degree of Master of Arts. I had attended a good deal to Education, and have written some Books on the Subject.

Have you ever been applied to, or the Board through you, to allow the Bible to be read in the Middle of the Literary Instruction?

I do not think I have; and I never would have encouraged such an Application.

After the Scripture Extracts were on the Board's List, did you find that during the early Years after that they were much used in the Schools?

I believe them to have been used in all the Schools in my District.

At that Time?

As they came out, or as they were supplied by the Board.

Then you mean to say that in your District they were freely used, the Parties buying them for themselves at that Time?

They were not saleable at that Time. The Board had announced that a gratuitous Stock of Books would be given for the Use of their Schools, and the People were anxiously waiting for this Stock; they did not wish to purchase for themselves, seeing there was a Prospect of getting them for nothing.

Then at no Time did the Schools purchase Scripture Extracts for their own Use?

I am sure they have; I know many Instances to the contrary.

After they were on the Board's List for Sale were they commonly used in the Schools under your Inspection?

I found that in general our Books were not bought by the People; there is an Inability, and even an Unwillingness, on their Part to purchase Books, and, indeed, on the Part of the Managers to go to the Trouble of purchasing them and supplying them for Sale to the Schools. I have often felt dissatisfied with Managers in consequence of their neglecting to supply their School with an adequate Stock of Books and Requisites for Sale to the Children.

When first the Scripture Extracts came out on the Board's List to be purchased at Half Price were they commonly so purchased and used in the Schools under your Inspection?

I cannot speak as to the Number of Schools that purchased them; but I can speak as to finding them read in my Schools generally, with the Exception of Two or Three. During my Inspection last Year the Teachers of these Schools I except stated that they were used occasionally; but I reported that the Book had no Appearance of being used; and in such Cases I have always in the Report Book of the School recommended them to be used every Day by all the Children competent.

Then are the Committee to understand that from the very first that those Books came out on the Board's List, and before they were granted gratuitously, you found them freely used in the Schools under your Inspection?

I have said that even after the Board had published the Books and had them for Sale I found many, I think the Majority, of the Schools inspected by me in want of our Books, and the Excuse was that they were waiting for the gratuitous Stock.

In point of fact, in the first Year after the Scripture Extracts were published, and were to be supplied by the Board at Half Price, were they used in the Schools under your Inspection?

From the Time the Schools were supplied with them, as far as I have seen, they were used, except in the Two or Three Schools I have just referred to.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

In the Interval before the gratuitous Supply was made, and when they were to be had by Purchase, were they obtained and used?

Some Schools purchased them; others neither purchased them nor any other of the Publications of the Board, waiting, as I have stated, for the gratuitous Stock.

Were there many, or few, that purchased the Scripture Extracts, and used them, according to your Experience, at that Time?

I have generally found those Books in the School when the other Publications of the Board were in it; and I have found no Indisposition on the Part of the People to use them.

In the Interval between the Publication of those Books, when they were to be had at Half Price, and the gratuitous Supply of those Books, did the Cases in which you had found them freely used in the Schools amount to a great Number?

I can say that in every Case in which the Schools were well managed the Manager supplied from the Time that he saw those Books published for Sale an adequate Stock of them, including those Extracts; but I am quite sure that the Majority of the Schools did not purchase our Books at all previous to that Period, waiting, as I have stated, for the gratuitous Stock; and more particularly those Schools which had the Remains of the Stock of Books supplied by the Kildare Place Society.

Are you not aware that One of the Fundamental Conditions required of the Board by Lord Stanley, and of the Schools by the Board; was a Supply of local Contributions for the Purchase of Books at Half Price?

I am quite aware of it.

Then as Inspector of the Board did you not feel it your Duty to make Inquiries in the Schools whether that Condition was adhered to?

I did.

Did you find that it was adhered to commonly?

In the Majority of Cases I found not. I have often recommended Schools to be struck off because the Managers would not supply them with an adequate Stock of Books. I stated that little Good could be done without an adequate Stock of Books.

You made that Recommendation to the Board in your Reports?

I did. I recollect One particular School, the Manager of which is a Presbyterian Minister of the Synod of Ulster.

In your general Reports to the Board at the End of the Year has that been a Particular upon which you have reported?

I reported it once after my First Tour, according to my Instructions.

Have you not given a General Report at the End of every Tour?

Only One.

Is it not peremptorily required of the Inspectors that they should make a General Report after every Tour?

It is so stated in their Instructions.

And you have obeyed that Instruction only once?

Only once.

Why?

Because I embody in every particular Report all the Information I can obtain, and besides I have never been asked for a General Report.

Do not you understand the Board as requiring a different Thing in the General Report; namely, a general View of the State of the Schools in the Tour of Inspection, which is a different Thing from the various special Reports upon the special Schools?

I did; and I made the First Report in consequence of so understanding it, but I understood afterwards, though not officially, that I was not called upon to make any more, nor do I think any Inspector did.

From whom did you understand that?

I cannot exactly state.

Did

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Did you understand it from any Member of the Board?
No.

Or from the Secretary of the Board?
No.

How did you understand what the Board would require of you in the Discharge of One of the specific Duties appointed to you, by Information from some Person who was neither a Member of the Board nor the Secretary of the Board?

I can only say that this was One of our Instructions, and that in consequence of it, at the End of the First Year, I made a General Report,—a very imperfect One as my Experience was very limited,—and that I have not since repeated it, but I have embodied all the Information I obtained in my particular Reports. I have often too given Suggestions, both verbally and in writing, to the Secretary, many of which have been adopted; every thing in fact that I thought necessary I communicated.

The following is a Part of the Inspectors Instructions:—"At the Close of each Tour of Inspection each Inspector will address a Letter to the Secretary, giving a General Report on the State of Education in the Districts which he has visited, noticing the general State of the National Schools, whether the Number of Schools and of Scholars be increasing or decreasing, and the Cause of either, the general Aspect of the Schools and Character of Schoolmasters, suggesting whatever Improvements may occur to him." You say that you complied with those Instructions the First Year?

I did; in consequence of those Instructions I attempted and sent in a General Report; but my Experience was very imperfect.

When your Experience became greater from having served longer as Inspector you omitted complying with this Rule?

I considered that this Rule was superseded by the Information previously supplied in each particular Report. I have given all the Information I could, both officially and otherwise, and every Suggestion that I considered necessary to make was made; and several of those Suggestions have been adopted by the Board.

Then subsequently to the First Year you made no General Report, and you understood from some Quarter, you do not know from what, but not from any Member of the Board or the Secretary, that it was not expected?

I understood we were not asked for it, and that is all I know.

Was it from any of your Brother Inspectors that you understood that?

It was in the Year 1833; I remember that I asked some of them if they had made a General Report, and they told me they had not.

Did they tell you why they had not?

I should think just from the same Motive which actuated me, that they had nothing to add to their Special Reports.

You have stated that your Reason was that you understood that it was not required?

Inasmuch as it was not demanded.

Then you are to be understood as saying that you ceased to give a General Report because you found that it was not demanded?

Yes.

In the first instance, at the End of your Second Year, must you not have omitted to do that Duty before you knew that it was not demanded of you?

I know that I did not do it, and that it was not asked of me; and in the meantime I was sent off on my Second Tour of Inspection.

What was the Reason of your not doing that Duty?

I do not know, beyond what I have stated; perhaps the Board did not require it because the Inspectors had suggested Things that were impracticable; perhaps I had done so myself.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Were those the Reasons that induced you to omit making those General Reports?

I can only speak for myself. The Reasons which induced me not to do it were that I had nothing to add to the Information I was constantly giving in my Reports and by Letter.

But it being expected that you would have nothing to add, the Board demanding that you should give a general View of the Schools, which should be quite separate from the Particulars in your Special Reports, you omitted to give that general View?

I did.

In point of fact were your particular Reports so full and so ample that you did not think there was any thing to add in a General Report?

Exactly so; in my particular Reports I have embodied the State of Education in the Neighbourhood, and all the Circumstances connected with Education in the District which I considered necessary.

Are you to be understood as saying that you did not do this, because you had given all the Information you could give under the particular Heads of particular Schools, and that you could add nothing to that?

That I had nothing worth putting upon Paper but what I had already previously reported.

In the Returns of the particular Schools?

Yes.

How could that have prevented you from "noticing the general State of the Schools; whether the Number of Schools and of Scholars be increasing or decreasing, and the Cause of either, the general Aspect of the Schools and Character of Schoolmasters, suggesting whatever Improvements may occur to you?" How could this general Statement have been included under particular Heads?

I know the general Character and Circumstances of every School in my District, and whether it has increased or diminished, with the Causes in most Cases of either; and in my Reports of each I often state this School has diminished, or this School has increased; and in fact there is a Question in the Inspector's Report which elicits this Information.

Did you hold yourself ready, if called upon, to give to the Board such a General Summary?

Certainly.

Do you know whether other Inspectors have made those General Reports?

I do not think that any one of them has, except for the first Year. If any one of them had done it I would have done it also.

Do you recollect which of the Inspectors told you that he had not done it?

I may say all of them; there were but Three of them at that Time. I asked them had they done it, and I found that they had not.

Could any Person who had read all your particular Reports make as good a General Report from them as you would have been able to make yourself?

I am sure that he could; and I do not see what the Commissioners could have asked us to add to those Reports.

That Instruction which directed you to make those General Reports proceeded from the Commissioners?

It did.

And you conceive that if they did not call upon you to comply with any given Part of their Instruction they dispense with it?

I did.

Do not you conceive that whatever might be the Case with respect to the Commissioners, that as annual Reports were to be made to Parliament, the Want of those Returns would prevent the Information being given to Parliament?

Certainly not; the Board have the Returns of each particular School, and they

R. Sullivan, M.A.

they have been so very minute in requiring such Information, that even the Name of every Child in each School is returned twice a Year to the Office.

You considered the Duty you had to discharge was to the Commissioners, not to Parliament?
Exactly so.

In order to enable you to make the Report of each School did you take Notes?
I did for my own Use; I then committed all the Information I had on the Subject to my Report and to my Memory.

Do you remember that any special Instructions were at any Time given to you to be watchful over Schools connected with Nunneries and Monasteries?
I do not recollect.

Have you inspected many of these Schools under Monasteries or Nunneries?
Five, I think.

What are they?
Newry, Drogheda, Navan, Mullingar, and Killina.

Is that in King's County?
Killina is.

Those are all Nunneries?
They are.

Did you inspect Dundalk?
Yes, I did.

Is that connected with a Monastery?
It is.

And Roundstone?
Yes.

Is that connected with a Monastery?
No; but the Teacher at present is a Person who is called a Monk. Roundstone is a new School established by the Board.

Did you always report on those Schools in the same Form as others?
Yes.

Do you happen to have made Notes relative to the Inspection of those Schools?
I merely make Notes for my own Use till I have committed the Information contained in them to my Reports. After this, they are of no Use even to myself, for if I want to refresh my Memory I refer to my Reports in the Office.

Therefore you would not like to trust your Memory as to any particular School Three or Four Years ago?
I have no Objection to be examined on any School that I have at any Time inspected.

As to the Nunnery School at Navan, did you inquire how the Grant was disposed of in that School?
I did.

What was the Answer?
That 100*l.* had been granted towards building and fitting up the Schoolroom. That was before my Inspection; it was only last Year for the first Time that I inspected that School.

You were told in that Nunnery School that 100*l.* had been given for the fitting-up?
Yes; it had been granted, investigated, and paid long before I went there.

For what Purpose was that given?
I understood that it was under the Head of building, or fitting up and furnishing.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Who was the Inspector that had visited that School before?
The first Inspector was Mr. Murray.

You always reported on those Schools in the same Form as others?
Yes.

What, in respect of those Schools, has been the usual Answer to the Query No. 9,—"What is the Amount of the Income of the Teacher, and whence derived?"
I make that Inquiry in all the Schools.

Do you recollect what the Answer has been in those Nunnery Schools in any One of them that you have mentioned?
Yes; I think the Name of the Teacher at the Navan School is Judith Bird; and that she receives 15*l.* per Annum from the Board. She is a respectable Person and an efficient Teacher, and not connected with the Nunnery.

Was there any School where the Nuns themselves were the Teachers?
I found Two out of those Five, Mullingar and Killina.

Do you recollect what Answer was given at those Schools to the Question, No. 9,—"What is the Amount of the Income of the Teacher, and whence derived?"
I recollect on going to Mullingar I found it different from the other Three I had inspected. I was surprised to find that the registered Mistress was a Nun, and before reporting upon the School I wrote to the Secretary stating that I found that the Mistress of the School was One of the Nuns, and that I conceived that to be irregular.

What was the Answer you received from the Secretary?
I think the Answer was that as the Salary was paid to the Person who was the recognised Mistress there was nothing irregular.

In this particular School what was the Answer given to the Question,—"What is the Amount of the Income of the Teacher, and whence derived?"
I have stated that I conceived it was irregular, and in consequence of this I did not go up to the Nun and put such Questions to her.

You made no Inquiry of the Nun?
I did not.

Do you understand the Board as requiring that there shall be some Portion of the Income of the Teacher provided by local Funds?
That was One of Lord Stanley's Instructions; but I only understood what the Board required of me through their Instructions, and that is not among their Instructions.

Is that One of their Instructions to you as an Inspector?
The only Instruction to us is, that we are to ascertain the Amount of the Income of the Teacher, and whence derived.

But you do know that it is One of the Directions to the Board in Lord Stanley's Letter, that they should be required, as a Condition of Aid to be given to the Schools, that the local Fund should supply some Part of the Income of the Teacher?
It so appears.

When a Salary was given to these Nuns are you aware that the Nuns are under Vows of Poverty?
I believe them to be so; and I understood that in Cases of that Kind the Money was expended upon the Children in providing them with Books and Premiums.

From whom did you understand that?
From the Manager of the School.

Did you go to the Manager of the School?
I recollect stating to the Manager that in the Navan, Drogheda, and Newry Schools (the other Convent Schools I had visited) I had found Lay Teachers; that I was surprised to find no such Person here, and that I conceived that to be irregular; that though the Nuns might superintend the Schools, and assist in

709

R. Sullivan, M.A.

teaching, I conceived it necessary that there should be a bonâ fide Mistress in the School, receiving a Salary; and then I wrote to the Secretary, stating that such was my Impression, and asked him was he aware that the Mistress of the School (Mrs. Nugent, I think, was her Name) was a Nun; and I think his Answer was, that as the Salary was given to the Person who was recognised as the Mistress, there was nothing irregular; that there was nothing in the Board's Instructions to prevent them from employing and remunerating any Teachers who conducted their Schools according to the Principles of the National System.

Then the Board considered Mrs. Nugent as the Mistress, and paid her a Salary as such, knowing her to be a Nun?
Yes.

Did you tell the Board that you understood the Money so given in the Case of Nuns as Teachers was employed in providing the Children with Books?
I do not recollect that I did.

You visited the School at Dundalk; was that last Year?
Yes.

Did you visit it before?
It was not in my District till last Year. I gave it a treble Inspection.

Did you inquire, as directed by the Thirteenth Query, into the expending of the Board's Grants?
I did.

Had you any Conversation with the Manager or Correspondent of the School upon that Particular?
It was in 1836 that I inspected that School, and that Transaction had taken place some Years before. The Expenditure of the Grant had been inquired into and reported upon to the Board long before, and the Money paid; and I never conceived it my Duty to re-open those Transactions again, unless I had understood that there was something further to be inquired into.

Had you any Conversation with the Manager or Correspondent of the School when you visited it in 1836, on the Mode in which the Board's Grant had been expended?
I asked the Question, as I do in every Case, if there was an Entry in the Report Book of the Money which had been granted, and the Expenditure.

Of whom did you ask that?
Of the Master. I dare say the Manager was present; I do not recollect.

Had you any Conversation with either the Manager or Correspondent of the School on that Point?
I recollect putting that Question, and getting a satisfactory Answer.

From whom?
From both I should say, for the Manager was in the School at the Time.

Are you satisfied that the Manager was present?
I was present in the School Two or Three Times. My Mode is, on arriving at a large Town where there are several Schools, to pay a hurried Visit to each before my Arrival can be known to them; and on the next Day to take the Schools in the Vicinity; which having done, I return and finish my Inspection of the Town Schools; and I know that the Manager was present either at my first Visit or when I returned to finish the Inspection of the School.

Did you make any Entry in the Report Book upon this Subject?
I did.

What was that Entry?
I recollect that they wanted more Money from the Board for Salary for additional Teachers, and they seemed dissatisfied because they had not obtained it, particularly when I told them that I would not recommend it, for I thought that the Board had been very liberal to them; and I think I stated in the Report Book or in my Report that the Grant of Salary already to this School was greater than the Number of the Pupils and the State in which I found it entitled it to, and that it was their Duty, and that in fact they had entered into a

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Contract to raise local Funds towards the Payment of the Salaries of the Teachers.

Did you make any Entry in the Report Book upon this Matter?
Either in the Report Book or in my Report.

Did you complain that the Rules were not kept; that other Books were used in the School besides those approved of by the Board, and no Subscriptions raised towards its Maintenance?
I did; I recollect that the Managers had failed in their Duty to provide the School with an adequate Stock of Books, and that in consequence of this the Children were bringing Spelling and other Books, which from being of different Kinds prevented proper Classification.

Did the Report you entered in the Report Book contain a "special Reference to the Scripture Lessons, as unanimously and cordially recommended by every Member of the Board, and that therefore the Neglect of them is in Violation of the National Board's Regulations"?
Yes, I recollect in Two or Three Instances making such Observations.

Did you in Dundalk?
I am sure I did, speaking of all the Books of the Board.

The Question is, whether you made an Entry, speaking of the Scripture Lessons "as unanimously and cordially recommended by every Member of the Board, and that therefore the Neglect of them is in Violation of the National Board's Regulations"?
No, I never said in Violation, because the Use of the Board's Books is not imperative. That is a Roman Catholic School, and I was very anxious that the Scripture Extracts should be read, and to effect this I stated that they were unanimously and earnestly recommended by all the Commissioners. By using the Word unanimously I wished to show them that their own Representative at the Board recommended them as well as the other Commissioners.

But you did not report any thing about its being a Violation of the Rules of the School?
No; I never considered it a Violation.

Do you recollect in that same Report stating that "the Board granted 259*l.* towards building the School, besides the annual Sum of 50*l.* for the Teachers and occasional Grants of Books"?
Those are the Facts; and I am sure I stated them to the Board, and to the People themselves.

Did you enter that Fact in the Report Book of the School?
I am sure I did.

Is not Mr. Coghlan the Correspondent?
He is.

He is a Friar?
I believe he is.

Was he present, and did he state to you that the Schoolhouse was built with Money collected by him in Dublin and elsewhere?
Part of the Money; I understood him to say only Part.

What Part did you understand to have been so said?
I understood him to say that the Board had, it was true, granted so much towards the Building, but that they required a great deal more, and that they had exerted themselves to raise Subscriptions to complete the School. My Observations were to show them that they were unreasonable to expect more Money from the Board while other Schools were getting so little; and my Impression was that they had been more liberally dealt with than some other Schools in my District which I found more meritorious.

As you spoke of 259*l.* so positively, can you state upon what Authority you stated that?
If the Figures are such I must have copied them from my Road Book. The Inspector has a Road Book, in which the Name of each School, the Post Town,

the Amount of Money granted, and the Salary to the Teacher are entered. The Grant had been made, and the Expenditure of it inquired into, long before my Inspection.

You say if those Figures are correct; you do not bind yourself to say that they are correct?

No; but I have no Reason to disbelieve it. I recollect that it was a large Sum, and that the House is a very large one, and must have cost a great deal.

Were you aware that the Board had ever stated that there had been an Application for this School for 114*l.* to complete the building of the Schoolhouse, upon an Estimate of 369*l.* 10*s.* 5½*d.*?

I do not recollect; those Circumstances all occurred before I was sent as Inspector to that District.

Were there any Protestants in the School?

I had no such Inquiry to make at that Time, but I should think that there were not. It was in 1836 that we were directed to make such an Inquiry for Mr. Carlile; but not till late in the Spring of that Year,—in the Beginning of May I think; my Inspection of that School was in March. However, from my Knowledge of the School, I am sure that the Children were all Roman Catholics.

Do you think that the Circumstance of the Correspondent of the School being a Friar has in this Instance advanced the original Object for which the Board was instituted, namely that of united Education?

I think not; but such Schools should be considered as Exceptions to the National System. But at my Inspection of the Navan Nunnery School last Year I found Two Protestant Children attending it.

You went to Roundstone?

I did.

In the course of the last Winter.

Yes; I was sent specially there.

Did you inquire into the Circumstances connected with the National School there?

As I have made a full and I trust an impartial Report of all the Circumstances connected with that School, I beg most respectfully to suggest the Production of it before your Lordships Committee; and if any of the Statements in it be impugned, I shall answer it.

Did you inquire into the Allegation of Fraud committed upon the Board with respect to the building of the Schoolhouse?

I had no such Inquiry to make. My Instructions were merely to investigate the Allegations contained in a Petition or Memorial forwarded by the late Master of the School, which was signed by a Number of Persons under the Head of Protestants and Roman Catholics, and to ascertain whether he had been unjustly dismissed or not.

Had you in fact any Discussion, or were you present at any Discussion, respecting an alleged Fraud committed on the Board in respect to the building of the Schoolhouse?

My Investigation was confined strictly to what I have stated; and I have reported fully upon all the Circumstances of this Dismissal. The House had been built long before my Visit, and I was not authorized to make any Inquiries into the Circumstances of the building of it.

The Question is, whether, being there, you did in fact hear any Discussion respecting an alleged Fraud committed upon the Board in respect to the building of the Schoolhouse?

Yes. I recollect a Person of the Name of King came to me and stated that he had sustained a Loss by contracting to build the School; that the full Amount of the Money that he contracted for had not been paid him.

Did he say what he had received?

I did not enter into the Matter, for it did not form any Part of my Inquiry.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

I told him that my Business was merely to inquire into the Allegations in the Memorial.

Was that all that passed upon the Subject of the alleged Fraud in respect of the building of the Schoolhouse?

This Person stated that he had not been paid by the People the One Third of the Expense which they had bound themselves to contribute.

Did he say by the Priest?

I do not recollect particularly. I think the Name of a Priest was mentioned, either by King or the Rev. Mr. Brown, as connected with the Matter. I understood him to be the Predecessor of the present Priest of Roundstone, and that he was dead. I did not pay much Attention to those Circumstances, because they formed no Part of my Inquiry.

Have you any accurate Recollection of any thing upon that Subject beyond what you have stated?

Though I did not believe that King had any Claim upon the Board, I recollect perfectly that on my Return to Dublin I looked into the Report of the Inspector of the District on this Transaction, and found that he had inquired from this very Man whether all the Money subscribed locally had been paid, and that he was informed by him that it had. This was reported to the Board, and the Two Thirds that they had promised were paid in consequence, and the House opened. After having received the Grant from the Board, this Man came forward with a Claim upon them for the Sum that should have been contributed locally. I told him that he must have formerly certified to the Board that he had received that Sum already, and that at all Events he had no Claim upon the Board, and that he acted fraudulently in the Matter.

Did he say that he had received all that he had contracted for but not all that he found that the Board had given, and that the People of the Place had agreed with the Board to give towards the School?

I did not so understand him; I understood that he had got all that the Board had promised, but that there had been a Deficiency locally.

In respect of displacing the former Master; did you inquire into an Allegation of Violence committed by the Priest or others in taking forcible Possession of the School and placing a new Master in it?

I inquired and reported fully upon all these Allegations, and my Report is in London. All the Reports of the Inspectors are in London except those which we have made this Year.

What was the Result of the Facts of alleged Violence in getting Possession of the Schools?

I recollect that I was sent by the Secretary, at the Desire of the Board, to investigate into a Memorial forwarded by Mr. Brown, the Protestant Curate of Roundstone. He wrote Two Letters on the Subject, One to his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin and One to his own Archbishop, and a Third I think to Lord Melbourne, in which he embodied the Circumstances of the alleged Violence. He stated that O'Flaherty, the Teacher of the Roundstone National School, had been dismissed by the Priest from the School unjustly, and that Violence had been used to eject him from it for the Purpose of putting in a Monk as Schoolmaster; and his Letters were accompanied by a Memorial from the Teacher, purporting to be signed by a Number of Persons under the Head "Roman Catholics" or "Protestants." I understood that my Inquiry was to ascertain whether Violence had been resorted to, and whether he had been deservedly dismissed or not.

The Question is about the Violence that was committed in getting Possession; what was the Nature of the Mode in which they got Possession?

First of all the Master sent a Petition to the Board, purporting to have been agreed to at a public Meeting at which it was stated Patrick King, Esquire, of Anlybeg took the Chair. This alleged Meeting, through the Chairman, petitioned the Board to raise the Salary of the Teacher of the Roundstone National School. On Receipt of this Petition the Secretary wrote to the Priest, the Correspondent of the School, on the Subject; and the Priest replied that he was not aware of the Circumstance, and that he had never heard that such a public

R. Sullivan, M.A.

public Meeting had taken place, and that he would feel obliged by the Board giving Directions to an Inspector to investigate the Matter. The Inspector of the District accordingly made Inquiry, and reported that the Petition had been got up by the Schoolmaster, and that it bore the Names of some of the worst Characters in the Parish; he added that the Teacher was a Person of bad Character, and that he had been frequently seen intoxicated. On Receipt of this Report a Letter was sent from the Board to the Manager, directing him to dismiss this Teacher from their School; and the Priest, acting upon this Order, went to the Teacher, and requested him to resign his Charge. He refused to give up the School, alleging that there were Arrears of Salary due to him. The Priest showed him the Letter of the Board desiring his Dismissal, and as he refused to vacate, he, as Manager, took forcible Possession of the Schoolhouse by taking the Door off the Hinges, and putting on a new Lock. All this occurred prior to my Inquiry. The Board wrote to Mr. Brown in reply to his Communication, and even sent him a Copy of the Inspector's Report, on which the Teacher had been dismissed by their Order. Mr. Brown impugned that Report, and in consequence of this the Commissioners directed me to investigate the Matter, which I did. On arriving in Roundstone I sent for the Schoolmaster who had been dismissed; I produced the Memorials and Letters, and told him that as I was determined to wait, if it should be till Christmas, till I had seen every Individual who had signed those Documents, it would save Time and be no worse for him if he would acknowledge to me what Part he took in the Matter, and whether those Signatures appended were genuine or written by himself: I also told him that if I found Reason for it I would recommend his Restoration. He then acknowledged, greatly to my Surprise, that most of the Signatures were written either by him or the Chairman, Patrick King. I asked him who and where Patrick King was; that it appeared by the Memorial that he was an Esquire, and that I was determined to see him. To this he made no Reply; and I repeated, "I must see this Patrick King, Esquire; I do not care how long it takes me, or to what Expense it puts me." On getting no Reply to this from the Teacher, I asked him, "Is not this Patrick King, Esquire, of Anlybeg, the Chairman of the Meeting, at present on the Treadmill in Galway Gaol?" and he acknowledged that he was. Yes, my Lords, this Man who was described to be an Esquire, and whose Name was in the highest and most honourable Place in the Memorial, I found on the Treadmill in Galway Gaol. Those Facts I reported to the Board.

Had the Board sanctioned the Appointment of the new Master at that Time?

They had not; they had no official Information of it till I reported on the Subject.

Had the Appointment of the new Master been sanctioned by the Board at that Time?

Certainly not; the Board were not aware of it officially.

Of what Description was this new Master?

I heard that he was a Monk.

Did he tell you so himself?

He did; I asked him.

Did he tell you of what Order he was a Monk?

I do not recollect, but I think of the Order of St. Francis.

Did he tell you that he was a Monk of the Third Order of St. Francis?

I recollect asking him if he was a Monk, and that he told me he was, which Fact I reported to the Board; but I cannot say whether I spoke as to his Order.

Did he say that he belonged to the Monastery of that Order recently erected at Roundstone?

I knew that Fact.

Did you see the Monastery?

Yes.

R. Sullivan, M.A.

Did you notice the Inscription upon it?
I did; I was Two or Three Days in the Village.

Can you repeat the Inscription?
It stated that this Monastery, I think, was founded by the Religious Brothers of the Order of St. Francis of Mount Bellew.

Did you include this in your Report to the Board?
I do not know; but I reported that the Man was a Monk.

Do you, on Recollection, feel yourself able to say whether you reported to the Board the Inscription that you saw on the Monastery?
I should think not; because if I had reported it to the Board I should have gone and copied it in order to report it accurately.

Is this the Inscription which you read: "Deus meus et omnia. This Monastery was founded by the Religious Brothers of Mount Bellew of the Third Order of St. Francis, by the Sanction and Approbation of His Grace the Most Reverend Dr. M'Hale, Lord Archbishop of Tuam, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin and our Holy Father St. Francis, to the greater Glory of God. November 18th, 1835."
To the best of my Recollection those were the precise Words.

Then there was a Statement that it was built under the special Sanction of His Grace the Most Reverend Dr. M'Hale, Lord Archbishop of Tuam?
I recollect seeing an Inscription to that Effect upon the Monastery at Roundstone, and I knew that the Teacher was one of the Monks belonging to it, but the School is not connected locally with the Monastery.

Did you in your Report tell the Board that this Teacher so proposed was a Monk of this especial Monastery?
I mentioned in this Report to the Board that the Master now in the School was a Monk. I cannot recollect that I stated what his Order was, and I am sure, to the best of my Recollection, that I did not state that. He was of the Third Order.

Then you did not tell the Board that this was a Monk of the Monastery recently established in that Village?
I stated that he was a Monk and belonging to that Establishment, to the best of my Recollection. I stated the simple Fact that he was a Monk.

Did you mention that he was a Monk belonging to the Establishment in Roundstone?
I am sure I led the Board to know that the Master I found in their School was a Monk belonging either to the original Establishment in Mount Bellew or to the Roundstone Branch of it.

Did you say that he was a Monk of the Monastery of Roundstone or was a Monk of Mount Bellew?
I recollect perfectly saying Mount Bellew.

Did you consider it a material Point for the Board to be acquainted with that he was a Monk of any particular Establishment?
No; just merely the Fact that he was a Monk.

Have you any Recollection of telling the Board that this Monk belonged to the Monastery in Roundstone, or not?
I am quite sure that the Board were aware, through my Report, that he was a Monk belonging to a Branch established in Roundstone by the Monks of Mount Bellew.

Now that your Attention is called to it, do you think there was any Matter of such Importance depending upon the particular Place where the Monastery to which he belonged was established, or upon the Inscription that was written over the Door of that Monastery, that should induce you, if the Matter were to come over again, to report that specially to the Board?
No; I considered it enough to say that the Teacher I found in the School was a Monk; and I think I stated that he belonged to a Branch founded in that Village by the Mount Bellew Monks.

Was the Schoolmaster who was dismissed a Monk?
He was not.

What

R. Sullivan, M.A.

What Religious Persuasion was he of?

It would be hard to answer that Question. He was originally a Roman Catholic. He married a Protestant Wife, but was considered, at least Mr. Brown told me so, a very bigoted Catholic, so much so that he would not allow his Wife to go to Church; but after his Quarrel with the Priest he not only allowed his Wife to go to Church, but became a Protestant himself. I do not know what his Religious Profession is now.

Did you hear, when at Roundstone, that the Monks of that Monastery generally had exhibited any great Hostility to the Protestants?

I never was in Connamara before; and I had been just sent there for that special Purpose, and could not be aware of any thing beyond what came to my Knowledge then.

When you were at Roundstone did you understand that it was commonly considered by the People that the Monks of this Monastery were vehemently hostile to the Protestants?

I heard some Statements from different Parties, which I do not particularly recollect.

Do you recollect that?

I think that Mr. Brown the Clergyman must have stated that to me; he stated more than that.

What did he state?

That those Monks were ignorant and intolerant, and the Priest bigoted, and such Things.

Were Instances of their Hostility stated to you of any Kind?

I recollect that Mr. Brown stated that those Persons were very intolerant, and that they on the other Hand stated as much of him. I saw that bad Feelings existed between the Parties.

Did Mr. Brown state to you any Instances of this Hostility to Protestants on the Part of the Monks of this Establishment?

I do not recollect any particular Instance.

Was the Priest Mr. Curran the Correspondent of the Board?

I think that was his Name.

Did you find that he was deemed hostile to the Protestants?

Mr. Brown spoke of the Monks and the Priest as being very intolerant and bigoted.

Was Mr. Brown the only Person that gave you this Account of the Monks and of Mr. Curran, or did you hear it from any other Person?

There were Two other Persons, a Mr. Nimmo and a Mr. Hay, who spoke as Mr. Brown.

Besides those Persons did you hear in the Place any thing from which you had Reason to suppose that Mr. Curran the Priest or the Monks of this Monastery were deemed generally in the Place to be hostile to Protestants?

I heard from those Persons that the Monks were ignorant and intolerant.

Without recollecting the Persons do you recollect to have received an Impression generally in that Place that such was the Opinion of the People respecting Mr. Curran and those Monks?

I saw that there was a very bad Feeling existing on both Sides; they represented each other to be intolerant and bigoted, and perhaps they are so.

Then supposing those bad Feelings to have existed on both Sides, does it appear to you, as a discreet Person, that it was likely to conciliate the Parents of the Protestant Children to appoint a Monk of this Establishment to be Teacher of the School?

I have no Hesitation in stating that it does not; and that if I could have removed him I would; and for this Reason, that I thought the Monks had no Right to take Possession of a School that did not belong to them.

Did you take any Step to endeavour to remove him?

I reported the Fact to the Board that he was a Monk; but I believe it is

R. Sullivan, M.A.

considered by many that those Men are not Monks, that they are merely Lay Brothers. They are however reputed Monks. It is as I have stated believed by many that they are not in reality Monks; and I think the latter is the View acted upon by the Board; and that they think there is nothing in their Instructions to prevent such Men from becoming Masters of National Schools.

Did you state your Opinion to the Board that it was unfit to appoint this Man Master?

I stated that he was a Monk; and I am sure that I led the Board to believe that my Opinion was against his Continuance in the School; and that it would be better under all the Circumstances to have a superior Teacher appointed, particularly a Person qualified to instruct in Navigation, as Roundstone is a maritime Village; in short that a Third Person should be appointed. I recollect intimating my Opinion to this Effect; though it was beyond my Duty as Inspector to intrude my Opinion as to what the Board should do. I introduced my Opinion in this Way: I stated in my Report that I had been asked my Opinion now that the Board had official Information of the Fact that a Monk had been placed in their School, would they confirm his Appointment; and that I stated as my Opinion that I thought not.

Did you state to the Board that you thought that, independently of this Person being a Monk or not a Monk, in your Opinion it was undesirable that he should be appointed Master?

I thought that the Fact of his being a Monk would prevent his Continuance in a School built by and belonging to the Board. I did not enter at all into his Literary Qualifications.

Did you say any thing to the Board in respect to the Expediency of appointing a Master who should have the Confidence of the People of that Place? Did you report your Opinion to the Board upon the Expediency of not sanctioning the Appointment of this Man?

I could wish that my Report were before your Lordships; it contains full Information on all these Points. Mr. Brown, in the first Instance, announced to the Board that a Monk had taken Possession of their School in Roundstone, and inquired whether they would confirm him in his Usurpation or not. I think the Answer he got to that Communication was that the Board had no official Knowledge of the Fact as yet, and I was sent down to investigate the Matter. I did so, and I recollect adding to my Report that I had been asked, now that the Board had official Cognizance of the Fact that the Master of their School was a Monk, whether they would confirm his Appointment or not, and that I had said I thought not, and that my Opinion was grounded upon the Distinction between Schools built by and belonging to Monasteries or Convents and Schools built by and belonging to the Board; or, in other Words, that though the Board might take the Monks Schools they ought not to allow the Monks to take theirs. I have not seen this Report since the Time I made it; my Recollection therefore, as to the Language I used, may not be accurate.

You stated the Facts, and then added to those Facts the Opinion that arose in your own Mind in consequence of them, although you did not think it Part of your official Duty to do so?

Exactly. My Opinion as to what the Board would do was given in confidential Conversation to Mr. Brown. While in Roundstone I stopped in the same House with him — an Inn, the only House of Accommodation in the Village.

Was any Part of your Report relative to the Inexpediency of appointing this Man because he would not have the Confidence of the People in the Place?

I think he has the Confidence of the People. I stated that this Man was a Monk.

Did you not think that when you had stated all the Facts to the Board they were better Judges than you of what ought to be done upon them?

Exactly.

Did you state to the Board that this Man seemed not to have the Confidence of the People in the Place?

I did not; I stated that if the Board did not confirm his Appointment

I begged

R. Sullivan, M.A.

I begged leave to suggest that a superior Master should be procured, and that as Roundstone was a poor Place a little more Salary than usual should be granted, in order to secure the Services of such a Person, particularly if he were competent to teach Navigation.

You clearly intimated in your Report your Opinion that this Man ought not to be confirmed in the Mastership?
I did.

Are the Majority of the People in that Place Catholics?
I should think that they are almost all Roman Catholics. The School is twice as large now under the Monks as it was under the other Teacher, who was also a Roman Catholic. The Confidence of the People has not therefore diminished.

Mr. Brown is the Curate of the Place?
Yes.

Does he reside in the Place?
He does. He lodges, as I have stated, in the little Inn, and his Flock assembles in his Apartment. There is no Church there.

Did you hear whether there were any Protestant Children at the School?
I do not recollect.

Did you hear whether, before it was placed under the Monk, Protestant Children had attended?
Mr. Brown may have stated so, but I cannot say whether he did or not.

Do you recollect whether you heard that before the Monk was there Protestant Children had attended the School?
I do not recollect that.

Have you reason to know that there is any such Protestant Population there, that there could be any Number of Protestant Children?
I believe not. The People are, I am sure, almost all Roman Catholics. They are in a very wild State; many of them cannot even speak English.

Is it not unfortunately the Case too often in Ireland that the Protestants abuse the Monks and the Monks abuse the Protestants?
Exactly so; and I found this Feeling existed more in Roundstone than in any other Place I have been in.

Can you state whether Mr. M'Clelland, to whom you alluded in the early Part of your Evidence, was suspended in consequence of that Transaction and afterwards restored?
I can; I was present at the Discussion. His Conduct was brought before the Synod at their General Meeting in 1835 by several of his Brother Ministers whose Pulpits he had taken forcible Possession of, and a Resolution was passed upon the Subject by the Synod, which stated that they viewed with great Regret the Conduct of Mr. M'Clelland in taking forcible Possession of the Pulpits of his Brother Ministers and disturbing the Peace of their Congregations, &c.; and in consequence of this he was required to demit his congregational Charge and to refrain from all Ministerial Functions for the present. There were other Resolutions, consigning his Congregation to the Care of his Presbytery, &c. I was under the Impression that he had been obliged to retire upon the Regium Donum, but I heard a short Time ago that he was reinstated in his congregational Charge very soon after by the Influence of Dr. Cooke, and not by an Act of the Synod.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Two o'Clock.

719

Die Lunæ, 22° Maii 1837.

The LORD PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evidence on the new Plan of Education in Ireland.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Mr. THOMAS JAFFRAY ROBERTSON is called in, and examined as follows:

Are you an Inspector under the Board of Education in Ireland?
I am.

How long have you been an Inspector?
Since May 1832.

In what Part of Ireland did you act?
The Two first Years in Connaught, and the latter of those Two in Part of Connaught and the County of Cavan; in the Two next Years in Four Counties of Munster; the last Year in Tyrone, Derry, and Donegal, and the present Year in Down, Antrim, and Armagh. In Two Winters I took Antrim separately, to finish it, in consequence of other Circumstances.

In what Way would you characterize the different Schools that you visited in your different Walks; that is, would you say that the Schools in one Part of Ireland are better or worse in any other respects than in another Part?
I have been so short a Time in the North of Ireland that it is difficult for me to form a Judgment about the Schools; but I think the Schools in the North are generally in a better State of Regulation than in the South and West, more particularly in consequence of the Want of Books that existed in some Portion of the Southern and Western District at the Commencement of the System.

The Schools in Connaught you found poorer in many respects, with less Intelligence and Advancement among the Masters, owing to the Poverty of the People?
I found them decidedly much poorer. It was in the very Commencement of the Establishment of the System that I visited Connaught; in 1832 and 1833, when the Books were not even ready for Delivery, I believe.

What particular Counties did you visit?
The entire of Connaught the First Year, and the Second Year, that is, the Year 1833, I was in Three Counties of Connaught, and the County of Cavan in addition. The District was changed before the End of the Year.

What were those Three Counties?
I started the Second Year in Connaught, and at the End of that Year some of the Counties were cut off, and I was left with Sligo, Mayo, Leitrim, (I think Roscommon,) and the County of Cavan.

Were you struck upon the whole with any Improvements, or the reverse, in the Schools in the latter Period of your Inspection, as compared with the former?
It so happened that in the Winter of 1835 I visited some of the Schools which I have also visited this Year, and I have Reason to think that a very considerable Improvement has taken place since that Time.

In what Counties?
In the County of Down.

Will you describe the Nature of that Improvement?
I had been at but few of the Schools at the former Period, because in 1835 I was only finishing the District in the County of Down; but the Improvements I allude

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

I allude to there are chiefly that in One or Two of the Schools they were better supplied with Books, and in others the Attendance has been rather better, and the answering of the Scholars I think better, though both the Seasons were bad Seasons for visiting the Schools, viz., Winter and Spring.

What Schools did you visit?

In Down I could not enumerate them all, but I suppose I visited between Two and Three Dozen of them; I visited the National Schools in and about Newry, and most of the Schools in and about Castle Wellan, and in and about Downpatrick, this Spring.

Were you one of those that were privately employed by Mr. Carlile to take an Account of the Proportions of Protestants and Roman Catholics?

I was.

Did you obtain that Information from the Masters generally, or in what Way?

From the Masters always.

Have you Reason to suppose that they gave you the Information with tolerable Accuracy?

I am inclined to believe the Information myself; I have seen the Masters, when they were in doubt, ask the Children in my Presence.

You have no Reason to doubt the Accuracy of the Information?

I have no Reason to doubt the Accuracy of the Information.

Do you think, from what you have observed, that the Proportion is any thing different from what it was originally; that there are more or fewer Protestants or Roman Catholics in proportion than there used to be?

I cannot answer that.

You said that the Schools have improved in the County of Down; from what do you draw that Conclusion?

I examined the Schools, and I judge by the answering of the Classes as compared with my Recollection of the previous Year; or, if necessary, with my Notes of the previous Year; having already been in Down for a short Time during the Winter of 1835.

Have you your Notes with you?

I have brought, I believe, all my Notes to London, but I have not them here.

Did you observe much Difference in the Schools according as the Schoolmasters had been trained in the Model School or had not had that Advantage?

I observed a very great Difference. Of course there may be One or Two that have been trained that have profited but little by it; but speaking of them generally, I think they were very much improved by it.

You think those Schools were decidedly the best which were under the Management of Masters that had been at the Model School?

Decidedly. I do not mean to say that other Schools have not been in some Instances good ones, but those under the trained Masters from our Model School are certainly much the best.

Have you had an Opportunity of examining any School where the Schoolmaster had been trained by the Kildare Place Society?

Those Schools which are now under the National Board I have examined where the Masters had been trained under the Kildare Place Society.

Were they good Schools?

They were better than the mere Country Schools, but I did not find that the Improvement of the Masters in point of Cultivation of Intellect was very great. I do not mean to bring a Charge against the Society, which has been of the greatest possible Benefit, but the System of training was directed more to the mechanical Arrangement of the Classes, and coming in and out from the Desks, rather than an intellectual Style of training.

So that upon the whole you consider the Schoolmasters that have been trained at the present Model School better than those trained at any other Model School?

I do.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Have you any Experience at Schools not under the Board?
I have visited Schools which were under Application, and I have occasionally gone into Schools that were neither under Application nor under the Board, merely to satisfy my Curiosity and to gain Information.

Did you ever see any Teachers that had been trained in any other Model School than that of the Board and of the Kildare Place Society?
I do not recollect seeing any.

Are you aware of there being any other Model Schools in Ireland?
I am not aware of any other.

Do you know the Schools in Dublin?
I do not; I have never inspected the Dublin District.

Have you never, during the Intervals of your Tours of Inspection, visited the Schools in Dublin?
I reside in Dublin during the short Period we spend at home.

And have you not gone into any of those Schools?
After my first Appointment, I went round with the Master of the Model School to visit a Number of such, to learn his Mode of Inspection; but during the Intervals since I have not, and I would scarcely undertake the Situation without greater Emolument, if I had to attend the Schools every Day that I am in Dublin, after the Fatigue of inspecting up to Christmas Day.

Do you recollect going to the Richmond Street School in Dublin, which has "Model School" inscribed over it upon one Board, and "National School" upon another Board?
I never was at the Richmond Street School, unless I may have visited it with the Master of the Model School on my Appointment.

And you do not happen to know whether any of the Masters you have seen elsewhere had been trained at that School?
No, I do not recollect any.

You have stated that you visited Schools in the County of Armagh; did you find many Schools having a numerous Attendance, both of Protestant and Roman Catholic Children, in the County of Armagh?
In most of the Schools that I visited in Armagh I found Members of both Denominations, though I cannot state the exact Proportions without reference to the Reports.

Were those Schools in Armagh formerly Schools under the Management of the Kildare Place Society?
I think there were some such, and perhaps the Majority.

Have you had any Means of knowing what the Attendance of the Children was while under the Kildare Place Society, both with respect to Numbers and with respect to the Religious Persuasion of the Children?
I have not.

Have you visited a School in Down called Ballymoney School?
I have.

Do you recollect any Circumstances connected with it?
The Ballymoney School formerly had a Teacher trained in the National Model School, which Teacher I understood was a very good one; he has since left it, and when I inspected it this Year the Teacher was one that I considered unfit, and whom I recommended to be dismissed. The School was in consequence in a proportionably bad Condition.

Who is the Correspondent of the School?
The Roman Catholic Clergyman of the Parish. I think it is the Reverend Mr. O'Neil.

Where is that School situated?
The Ballymoney National School is within about Three Miles of Castle Wellan, on the High Road between Newry and Castle Wellan.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Where is it placed?
Close to the Roman Catholic Chapel-yard, but separated from it by a Partition Wall.

It is within the Precincts of the Chapel-yard?
I am not certain whether the Tenure of the Ground is that by which the Chapel-yard is held; I think not, for I think I heard the Roman Catholic Clergyman say that he had got a Lease of that separate Portion lately upon which the Schoolhouse was built. I know he had it not before, because I heard from him that he was refused Aid by the Board for building the Schoolhouse in consequence of not having a Lease.

With respect to the Children attending the School, do you remember their Religious Persuasion?
I think they were mixed. I cannot state the Proportions without reference to the Report.

Are you a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?
I am a Protestant.

Have you ever visited the Schools in Galway?
I have.

In what Year?
I was in Galway in the Years 1832 and 1833.

Do you know the School at the Presentation Nunnery?
I have been there.

Were all the Children there Roman Catholics?
They were, I believe.

Is that situated in a Park?
To the best of my Recollection it is within the Walls that inclose the Nunnery and whole Establishment. Whether the Entrance to the Nunnery be precisely the same as to the School, I do not recollect.

Do you recollect whether you pass through the Nunnery to get to the School?
To the best of my Recollection I did not pass through the Nunnery.

You pass through the Inclosure?
I passed through the Inclosure, which I understood to contain the whole Establishment. There is an Entrance through a Wall.

Is it such a Place as you would call a Park?
Those Establishments are usually surrounded with high Walls.

It is within the Town of Galway?
It is.

And this School was within the high Walls surrounding the Place?
I think it is; but I cannot remember precisely, for it is about Four Years since I have been there.

Is there any other School in Galway?
In the Town there is a Male School.

Where is that situated?
That is connected with a House where the Roman Catholic Clergy live.

Is it called a Monastery?
No; I never understood it to be a Monastery.

Who are the Directors of that?
The Person to whom I was officially directed was the Rev. Mr. Finn, whom I understood to be one of the Secular Clergy of Galway.

Is that School under the Management of the Monks?
The Teachers of that School when I visited it were Lay Monks.

In the Habit of Monks?
No; they were in no peculiar Habit.

In what State was that School?
It was rather a good School, though I found in it a Violation of the Rule regarding Religious Instruction. The first Year I visited it the Cholera was raging, and all the Schools were closed or in the greatest Confusion. That was in 1832.

In 1833 did you think well of the School?
I thought it conveyed a good deal of Instruction to the Children.

Did you see any Crucifixes hanging up in the Schoolroom?
No, I saw nothing of the Kind.

Was there not a small Chapel close by?
Part of the same Establishment may have contained a Chapel, for any thing I know; but I can say nothing about it. I observed only the School.

Did you pass by the Door of the Chapel to go into the School?
I cannot recollect that.

Was it under the same Roof as the Religious Establishment?
No; the Two Schoolrooms constitute a very large Two-storied House. I speak only from Memory.

Is it within the Doors or the Precinct within which the Religious House is where the Clergy reside?
The Inspector who has been in this District last can answer that Question much better than I can. I know that I did not go through that House, or through any Place of Worship, or through any Roman Catholic Clergyman's House, to go into the School; I went directly through an open Yard to the School.

Was that open Yard the Yard of the Monastery?
I was not aware that there was a Monastery there.

Did you visit the School at Westport?
I did; I think I visited it both in 1832 and 1833.

Are there not Two Schools at Westport?
There were at Westport a Boys School and a Girls School.

What was your Opinion of those Schools?
My Opinion of those Schools was favourable in 1833, considering the Circumstances they were under.

What Circumstances do you refer to?
At that Period the Schools were very seldom sufficiently supplied with Books.

You mentioned that the Monks taught in that School at Galway; what did they teach? Was it merely that they engaged in the Religious Education, or were they the Teachers of the Classes?
The Monks that I mention are not Clergy; they are Lay Brothers, bound to certain Religious Observances for a certain Number of Years, or for their Lives; and they were the Teachers of the general Literary Education given in the School.

Did you ascertain in the Monks Schools and in the Nuns Schools whether the Scripture Extracts were in use?
I did; and in the last of those which I inspected,—I believe it was the one at Newry,—I examined a Class in the Scripture Extracts, and they answered me very well.

Did you find the Scripture Extracts in the Nunnery and Monastery Schools in Connaught?
At the Period when I was there very few of the Schools were supplied with Books, but those that had any had the Extracts in common with the other Books.

And those Extracts appeared to be in use?
Certainly.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

And in the same Way in the Monastery Schools?
And in the same Way in the Monastery Schools precisely. I speak only from Memory.

Do you remember visiting the Esker School?
I do.

That is in the County of Galway?
Yes.

At the Time were you struck with the Appearance of an Altar in the School-room?
At that Time I was very inexperienced, and I think I did not do my Duty so accurately as I ought to have done. I mean to say that I had never seen a Roman Catholic Altar in my Life, and a Recess was pointed out to me where a Person sat to read Prayers before the School commenced, and at a certain Hour in the Middle of the Day; the latter Hour was afterwards abolished by Order of the Board. I reported those Particulars; but if there were an Altar, I did not know it, for I had never seen an Altar in a Roman Catholic Chapel.

You say you were inexperienced at the Time when you were elected Inspector; did you undergo any Examination?
It was not, strictly speaking, an Examination; it was rather an Inquiry to elucidate what Kind of Persons we were; what Station of Life we had been living in, and what Habits we had been accustomed to. But when I stated I was inexperienced, I alluded, not merely to the Duties of Inspector, but to the Ceremonies connected with the Roman Catholic Chapels. I was well acquainted with the Management of Schools.

Do you recollect whether you were present when any Inquiries were made of you and the other Inspectors respecting your Knowledge of Buildings?
The Inquiry was made, I believe, of all. I cannot say as to any one but myself; but it was made with regard to me, and I stated that my Knowledge on the Subject was very trifling indeed. I had seen some Buildings going on when residing in Westport.

Were you a Native of Westport?
No; I am a Native of Dublin, but I resided in Westport for some Years.

Then you are well acquainted with Westport and its Neighbourhood?
I am well acquainted with Westport and its immediate Neighbourhood. This was long before I had any Connexion with the Schools there.

Down to how late a Period do you know the State of the Schools in Mayo?
The last Time I was in the District was in the Year 1833; but I cannot say what Period of 1833 I was in Mayo; I cannot give the State of those Schools so well as the last Inspector in that District.

Did you find them very bad or very good?
I found them, generally speaking, indifferent, and that arose from their not being completely supplied with Books.

Did you find that they attended to the Condition of the Board that they should provide a Fund for the Supply of Books and Requisites at Half Price?
I found that in some Instances such Fund was provided, not formally, but when the Inspectors stated to the Patron that such a School required Books, he either collected it or paid it out of his own Pocket.

Are you aware that in the List of the Regulations presented by the Board to Parliament as published by them as the Regulations or Conditions on which the Board grants its Aid, that the very first of these is that they require that a local Fund be raised, first, for the annual Repairs of the Schoolhouse and Furniture, secondly, a permanent Salary for the Master, thirdly, a Sum sufficient to purchase Books and School Requisites?
I am aware that there is such a Regulation in Print.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Is it carried into effect?

Those are Circumstances much more between the Patron of the School and the Judgment of the Commissioners than for me to decide upon; Applications, until the Year 1836, being sent direct to the Office, and not seen by the Inspector, he could not learn from such Applications what Provisions might have been made.

Are you aware that those Things were provided for when Applications were granted?

I always understood that Rule to mean that those Things should be provided pending the Execution of the different Works. With respect to the Teacher's Salary, for instance, a local Fund is raised by the Payments of the Parents for their Children, and local Funds for building are sometimes raised beforehand. Indeed, in the North it is frequently raised beforehand, so far as I know; but in the poorer Parts of the Country it is necessarily made up as the Work goes on in some measure by the personal Labour of the Inhabitants.

The Question refers to providing a Fund for the Purchase of Books and School Requisites at Half Price?

I have explained how that Point has been usually acted upon. I do not conceive that such a Fund is collected in any regular Way before the School is applied for; but I always understood, and I have seen it done frequently, that the Fund is provided either by the Patron himself out of his own Resources, or by a Collection amongst the People so soon as he gets Aid from the Board.

Then do you mean to say that as soon as the Board takes those Schools into their Connexion immediately the Schools supply that Fund for the Purchase of Books and School Requisites?

Whenever the Patron does his Duty it has been so.

Did you, as Inspector, report when that was not the Case?

I always did.

Did that frequently happen?

In the early Part of the System it did frequently happen, because the Patrons had been accustomed to get Books gratuitously, and it was difficult to persuade them that they were not still to get them so.

In the Year 1832 you visited the Schools in Connaught, and again in 1833?

I did.

Did you visit the same Schools again?

I did.

Did you find, in 1833, that the Schools which you had reported in 1832 as not being supplied with Funds for the Purchase of Books and School Requisites were supplied with those Funds generally in 1833?

I could not answer that Question without going through my Reports.

Then you have no general Impression whether or not in 1833 you found the Schools in Connaught supplied with Books?

I could not answer that without referring to the Reports of the Two Years.

When did the gratuitous Supply of Books first begin to be issued?

I think it was in the Year 1834 or 1835 that the Issue began.

Can you state whether, generally, in the Year 1834 you found in the Schools in Munster that this Fund which is spoken of here was in fact provided?

I cannot answer that Question without referring to my Reports. At that Time the Patrons were expecting a gratuitous Donation of Books, and in many Instances they waited for that; in others they bought them.

Can you give your general Impression upon the Subject?

That is the nearest general Impression I can give. I found many Schools without a sufficient Supply of Books during 1834 and 1835.

Did you ever receive any Instruction from the Board to make Inquiry as to the Books of Religious Instruction which were used in the Schools?

No, I did not.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Are you aware that that is one of the Regulations and Conditions on which Aid is required, that the Board were to have the entire Control over the Books, whether in combined Moral and Literary or in separate Religious Instruction?

I understood that such was the Rule; but it is a Matter to be decided altogether by the Board.

No Reference was ever made to the Inspectors to see whether that Rule was attended to?

We were required to find out whether they gave Religious Instruction, and at what Hour; and also to state when any Books of peculiar Religious Instruction were found at undue Hours; and I always stated when I found Books of peculiar Religious Instruction in a School.

But you were not directed to inquire what Books were used in the School at the Time of separate Religious Instruction?

No, I was not.

What Success is found in Munster particularly to have attended the National School System in its main Object of uniting the Protestant and Roman Catholic Children in the Schools?

In Munster there were very few Protestant Children at our Schools, inasmuch as the Population is almost exclusively Roman Catholic in many Places.

Are you aware that by the Return made by the Commissioners of Public Instruction the Number of Protestants to Roman Catholics in Munster is about as One to Ten?

I am not aware of that Fact.

Have you seen the Returns made by Mr. Carlile?

I only know the Portion of it made by myself.

Are you aware that it appears that there is only 1 in 124 Protestants to Roman Catholics in Munster attending the Schools?

That may possibly be the Case, because the original Return may embrace those of all Classes, Adults as well as Children, and there may be a much smaller Proportion of Protestant Children to Roman Catholics than that stated in the gross Return.

Do you think it is probable that there is a much smaller Proportion of Protestant Children to Roman Catholic Children than of Protestant Adults to Roman Catholic Adults?

I did not say that; but the gross Return embraces Persons of all Ranks and all Grades.

When you speak of Children, do you mean Children attending Schools for the Poor?

I speak of such, but the Returns of Population may speak of Children of all Grades; and I believe that a greater Proportion of Protestants than of Roman Catholics belongs to a Grade for whom those Schools are not intended.

You are aware that in large Portions of Munster there is a numerous Protestant Population of Poor?

If there be I should think it must be very much scattered.

Do you know the Parish of Skull in Cork?

I know where it is, but I have never been in it, except at a Place called Ballydehob.

Do you know that in that Place there is a very large Proportion of poor Protestants?

I am not aware of that. We have no School at Ballydehob; at least they had not when I was there; but I recollect a School in Munster in which there were Ten or Twelve Protestant Children, namely, Glandore National Female School, and a Protestant Teacher was appointed when I was there, although it is under Roman Catholic Management chiefly.

Do you know the Town of Youghall?

I do.

Are

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Are you aware that there are nearly 2,000 Protestants in the Town of Youghall?

I should conceive there must be a Number of Protestants in the Town of Youghall.

Are you aware that there is not a single Protestant in the School at Youghall?

No. When I was in Youghall I was not directed to make a Return of the comparative Number of Roman Catholics and Protestants; but in any Place where there are Schools under exclusively Protestant Management and Principles it is natural to suppose that Protestant Children would go there.

Is there a School of that Description at Youghall?

There is such a School, to the best of my Knowledge.

It appearing by this Return that there is no Protestant Child in the Youghall Male National School, you see that there must have been a great many that did not attend that School who would be in a Condition to attend, but you explain that by thinking they went to purely Protestant Schools?

I have generally found that to be the Case, and I should suppose it was so in Youghall.

Did you inquire when you were in Munster, whether the Scriptural Schools were attended at all by Roman Catholics even in Places like Youghall?

By Scriptural Schools I presume are meant those that are conducted by the Kildare Place Society; but I should not consent to say that the National Schools were not Scriptural Schools.

In common Parlance are not they Schools which are called Scriptural Schools?

They are.

Are you aware whether the Roman Catholic Children in Munster frequently attend those Schools which are commonly called Scriptural Schools?

I think they do; but I cannot say frequently; and my Authority for so saying is, that I have heard a Roman Catholic Clergyman say that he let the Children go to such a School because he had no other that he would prefer more.

Then you would be surprised to hear of their going to those Scriptural Schools where a National School is in their immediate Neighbourhood?

That would depend upon the Character of the Teacher and the Style in which the School is kept up, because I have found in the National Schools the Roman Catholic Children reading a Protestant Bible. I have found in Schools in the North, where the Bible is read, as it is generally in those under Protestant Management, in the Hours set apart for Religious Instruction, the Roman Catholics join in it as well as the Protestants.

And without any Difficulties made?

Without any Difficulties made in the slightest Degree.

So that there is a great deal of Scripture Instruction given in those National Schools in the North of Ireland?

That is my Impression; and in all Schools where Protestants have taken their due Share in the Management and Patronage of the School.

By due Proportion, what do you mean?

In a Parish where there are Protestants, if the Protestant Clergyman sets his Face entirely against the National School, and uses his Influence to prevent the Children of his Flock going there, in that Instance it becomes exclusively, or in some degree exclusively, under the Direction of the Roman Catholic Clergyman; not so far as to violate our Rules, but so far as to prevent the Introduction of any great Degree of Scriptural Education.

In Munster and in Connaught should you think that in those Parishes where there is not a large Proportion of Protestants, the Protestant Clergy could secure Scriptural Instruction in the National Schools in the same Way which it is given in the North of Ireland?

I think they could decidedly.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

You think the Roman Catholic Priests in Munster and in Connaught would not so set themselves against it as to prevent the Thing being effected?

I think they could not prevent the Thing being effected as long as the School is a National School.

You think that as long as the School is a National School, so long the Roman Catholic Children in Munster and Connaught would read the Bible out of the Time for general Literary Instruction, at the Time of separate Religious Instruction, if the Protestant Clergy joined in the Management of the School?

I do not say that the Roman Catholic Children would, though I think it likely that they would; but what I mean is this, that if the Protestant Clergyman joined in the Management of the School, I should say he has a Right to claim a Portion of Time, before or after the general School Business, in which he would have the Scriptures read by those of his own Flock; and then if the Roman Catholic Children chose to join, they would be at full Liberty to do so.

And, in point of fact, you think they would join?

In point of fact I think, unless where personal Feelings took place between the Parties, they would join, as I have seen it done in the North of Ireland.

Have you ever seen it done in any other Part of Ireland besides the North?

I cannot call to mind an Instance at present, except the Schools on Lady Clare's Property in Limerick. I have seen it done in Schools in the Chapel-yards, and under Roman Catholic Patronage. I have seen both Parties reading the Bible. I have not always seen them with the Books open, but I believe that they did. I heard a Class in one School.

Who has conducted the Scripture Class in those Schools?

The Schoolmaster.

Was it in all Cases a Protestant Schoolmaster?

In the Case I was speaking of it was a Roman Catholic Schoolmaster.

Had he any Directions as to the Selection of the Portion to be read, or was it left to his Discretion?

I understood it to be left exclusively to his Discretion.

Do you believe that the Roman Catholic Priests would continue as favourable to the present System if it were generally patronized and supported by the Protestant Clergy?

I think they would, except in Instances where there has been any thing like personal Collision between the Parties on Political Subjects; but I think generally they would.

Do you think that would be the Case at the Schools that you describe, taught by Monks at Galway, or by the Friars at Esker?

I must except Monks and Friars Schools, which are not likely to be patronized by both Parties.

Those were, however, National Schools?

They were made National Schools, I believe, upon the Principle that they must be better by being made National Schools.

Are not those Schools more exclusively Catholic, necessarily, from the State of the Population, than any other Schools?

I should say that those which I have been in were as much exclusively Roman Catholic, from the State of the Population, as from any other Cause. I should say that they would be exclusively Roman Catholic, even if there were Protestants in the Neighbourhood. I am speaking of the Nunnery Schools and the Schools taught by Monks. I argue from this that I have not seen Protestant Children in the Schools.

Do not you think it would be objectionable for Protestant Children to attend the Schools?

I do not think that the Teacher of the School would interfere with the Religion of the Protestant Children, but at the same Time I do think it would be objectionable.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

You have said that you believe that the Monastery Schools and the Nunnery Schools would be chiefly Roman Catholic Schools even if they were not directed by Nuns and Monks. Now at Youghall, where you have said there is a large Population of Protestants, what is there to make the Youghall National School an exclusively Roman Catholic School, if it were not under the Direction of Monks?

It was not under the Direction of Monks when I was there.

Are you not aware that it has now become under the Direction of Monks?

Not of my own personal Knowledge. I heard that it was.

Then if Youghall be under the Direction of Monks, would your Observation of its being necessarily, from the State of the Population there, an exclusively Roman Catholic School, apply to Youghall, or would that be an Exception?

Certainly that must be an Exception to it.

If also any Schools are taught in Dublin by Monks, and it should appear that, although those Schools were attended by a great Number of Children, they were still all Roman Catholics, would that form another Exception to your Observation?

I cannot pretend to answer about a District with which I am totally unacquainted.

Are you aware that there is a large Protestant Population in Dublin?

There is, I presume.

Then, supposing that there are Schools in Dublin taught by Monks, would not that be another Exception to the general Observation you have just made?

If such be the Case it must be an Exception; but the Observation that I made was, that generally speaking those Schools happen to be so situated that they would probably be mostly Roman Catholic, whether they were taught by Monks or Nuns or not, as in the Instances mentioned. I believe that there are Schools on exclusively Protestant Principles in the Vicinity.

What Sort of Teachers did you find the Monks in general?

The Monks in general, as Teachers, were sufficiently acquainted with the common Rudiments of Education given in such Schools, but beyond that they were not educated Persons.

You now speak of Lay Monks?

In Ireland "Monks" means "Lay Monks," and nothing else. Friars are different Persons altogether.

In Esker they are Friars, are they not?

No, they are not. There is a Friary at Esker, but it is not those that are the Teachers, as I understood.

Is there any large Protestant Population at Newry, where there is a Nunnery School?

I must suppose that there is; but One of the Circumstances to which I allude is the Fact, that where there are Schools under a peculiar Protestant Patron and upon peculiarly Protestant Principles, the Protestant Children go there in preference to a School that is not so peculiarly Protestant; and that is the Case at Newry.

Do not you believe that if at Newry a School was set up upon the Principles of the Board, and not conducted by Nuns, that School would have a much better Chance of being useful to the Protestant Population than a School so superintended by Monks or Nuns?

I do.

At Newry can you, in point of fact, get into the School without going first into the Nunnery?

I understand the Entrance to the School and the Nunnery to be the same; at least I did go into the Parlour of the Nunnery and into the Schoolrooms through the same Door leading from the Archway to the Street.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Can you get into the School without going into the Nunnery?
I cannot say what Part of the Building is to be considered Part of the Nunnery; but you must go through the Hall of the Nunnery to get into the School, unless there be some other Entrance which I was not through. I find, by reference to an Inspector who has been frequently in this School, that there is a direct Entrance into the Schoolrooms from the Lane.

Have you inspected any Schools in the County of Clare?
I have.

What Schools?
I inspected about Twenty. I inspected the Schools in Ennis.

Did you inspect any School at Ennis taught by the Nuns or Friars?
I inspected a School at Ennis taught by Monks.

Is that a School near the Outside of the Town?
At Newton Stackpool; about a Quarter of a Mile outside the Town.

Who were the Teachers of that School?
Monks.

Monks in Holy Orders?
No; Lay Monks.

Do you know any Monks in Holy Orders?
No, I do not.

In the School at Newton Stackpool do you know whether there are any Protestant Children?
I do not know, but I think there are not.

Are you aware that the Board gave a very large Sum for the building of that School?
I am aware that a Grant of that Kind was made, and I presume that it has been paid. When I first went, there was a Dispute about the Lease. When I afterwards went there I understood that the Lease had been satisfactorily settled, and the Grant paid.

A Grant of 200*l.*?
I think it was about that.

Is there any Protestant Population thereabout?
I think there must be Protestants in Ennis, in so large a Town, with a Population, I suppose, of 15,000 or 16,000.

Is there any other National School there?
When I was there, there was a Female School, which I can scarcely call a National School, although receiving Aid, for it had been shut and opened again in some Confusion in consequence of various Circumstances. I believe that School has been since struck off, but am by no means certain.

Then the Fund to which the Board gave 200*l.*, under the Direction of those Lay Monks, was in a Place with a Population of 15,000, where you conceive there must have been a large Number of Protestants?
I did not say a large Number; I said I took for granted there must have been Protestants; and my Guess as to the Population is a mere Guess.

Upon the whole, do you consider it a District in which the Roman Catholics predominate very much?
Very much indeed.

Are there any other Schools in the Town of Ennis for the Poor?
I think there are several others.

Have you visited the School at Ennistymon?
I have.

What is the State of that School?
The Male School, when I was there, was a good School.

Who

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Who were the Teachers there?
Both the Teachers there were Lay Monks.

Are there not some Persons in Holy Orders also engaged in teaching there?
Not to my Knowledge when I was there.

What other Schools in that County did you inspect; did you inspect any in Kilrush?
We had no School in Kilrush.

Have you had an Opportunity of inspecting any Schools at different Times which are not under the Board?
I have not regularly inspected such; but I have visited occasionally Schools not under us, and also Schools that were applied for or about to be applied for; but of course not National Schools at the Time I went, and probably not since.

Have you visited those Schools sufficiently to form any Opinion as to the Degree of Proficiency in common Education to be found in them?
I think I have. I should say that they are worse decidedly than those that have been for some Time National Schools.

Can you state any particular Instances exemplifying the Deficiency of the Education in such Schools?
I remember visiting, for the Purpose of getting an Application, Schools in the Town of Kinsale, under the Patronage of the Roman Catholic Clergyman of the Parish, and I thought them very bad indeed; much worse than almost any National School I have ever been in.

Have you had Occasion to remark any Ignorance in the Scholars of such Schools with respect to either Spelling or understanding the Meaning of Words?
In most Instances those whom they called Readers knew nothing about reading beyond an Attempt at pronouncing the Words. They had no Idea of any thing like the Meaning of the Words; and when they could spell, their Style of spelling was of the very worst Description.

Have you visited any Schools in the North of Ireland that were not under the Board?
I have visited One or Two in a similar Way.

In the County of Down?
Yes, I have visited some in the County of Down.

Any large School?
The School I allude to is not a large School; it is a School in a Roman Catholic Chapel-yard, and it is a very indifferent one, a few Miles from Castle Wellan; that Place is called Dikement. It is in a very rough difficult District, and the Road is very bad and unpleasant to travel.

Have you visited the School at Rostrevor?
I have.

Where is it situated?
That School is not a National School; it is situated under the House in which the Roman Catholic Clergyman lives; I believe it was struck off for that Reason. It is not national now.

What Sort of School was it?
I think, compared with the Generality of the unpatronized Schools not under Societies, it was rather better than otherwise. It had the Remains of some of the National School Books in it.

Do you remember whether there were any Protestant Children in it?
I took down those Particulars, and entered them in my Report.

Was this a School that you reported upon?
This Year I did; it was under Application. To the best of my Recollection there were no Protestants in that School.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

You would hardly have expected to find any Protestants there, when it had been under the Eye and Superintendence of the Catholic Clergyman, and not under the Board?

I should not have expected it under the Circumstances. There would have been more Chance if it had been a National School.

Was there a Roman Catholic Master?

Yes.

With respect to the Ballymoney School, it appears that there are Six Protestants attending that School. Do you consider the Smallness of the Number of Protestant Children to arise from the Proximity of the School to the Chapel?

No, I do not think it arises exclusively from that. So far as I know of that District, the Roman Catholics preponderate very much in the immediate Neighbourhood of the School, and I should say it arises from the State of the Population,—fully as much or more from that Circumstance, because I find Protestants frequently in Schools held in Roman Catholic Chapel-yards.

But you do not think it likely that the Parents of Protestant Children would prefer to send their Children to that School if they could find any other under Protestant Management?

That would depend upon the Character of the Master; I have found that if they like the Master they will send them to Schools in Roman Catholic Chapel-yards.

Was the Master of that School a Roman Catholic?

When I was there he was; he had been there but a short Time.

Did you commonly inquire the Religious Denomination of the Teacher?

We inquired for the Purpose of discovering who gives the Religious Instruction; it is generally given by the Master.

In Munster did you find that they were almost all Roman Catholic Masters?

I recollect but One Instance of a Protestant Teacher in Munster.

In what School was that?

That was the Glandore Female National School.

Was that School under the Management of a Lady?

A Lady is the most active Manager—Miss Adams.

Very much distinguished for her Attention to Schools?

Very much indeed; I wish we had many more such Patrons.

Have you visited the Killaloe School?

I have; and that is another Instance of an Exception to what I stated.

Are the Teachers Protestants?

To the best of my Recollection they are both Protestants.

They are Man and Wife?

They are.

Where is the School held?

It is held in the Vestry and Chapter Rooms of the Protestant Cathedral.

By whom was that School put under the Board?

It was under the Board when I came into the District, but I believe it was placed under it by the present Bishop of Limerick, Dr. Knox, who was then Bishop of Killaloe, I think.

Have you any Recollection of the Number attending?

When I saw it it was rather a small School.

How long since was that?

That was in the Year 1835.

Do you happen to know whether the Roman Catholic Clergyman interfered in any way to prevent Roman Catholic Children from attending that School kept in the Vestry and Chapter House?

I do not think he did. I spoke to him on the Subject, and I understood from him that he did not interfere.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Did any Person accompany you, connected with the Management of the School, when you were there?

Not when I was inspecting the School, but I saw the Protestant Clergyman, who was the acting Patron.

He was the Correspondent?

He was.

Did you inquire whether the Protestant Clergyman was in the habit of teaching in the School, or of teaching the Protestants in their separate Religious Instruction?

I understood, to the best of my Recollection, that the Protestant Curate was in the habit of giving Religious Instruction occasionally at the Hours appointed for the Purpose.

Did you hear whether the Roman Catholic Priest was in the habit of attending also?

I find by my Report that the Religious Instruction was given in this School by the Protestant and Roman Catholic Clergymen.

Were there any Roman Catholic Children attending that School?

We were not in the habit of taking the Numbers, but I have no Doubt there were; I am certain there were.

With respect to the Individual who put it under the Board, do you think it was not the present Bishop of Derry, when he was Bishop of Killaloe?

I cannot say as to that, but I think it was not; for I waited on Dr. Knox, in Limerick, upon the Subject, and if he did not exactly put it under the Board, he acted as Patron.

Have you ever heard any Reason assigned why the Roman Catholic Priest does not attend that School?

No, I have not.

You stated that you considered that the Roman Catholic Clergy would not object to superintend Schools where the Protestant Clergy also superintended them; is not this an Instance of the contrary taking place?

No, I do not consider it so, because the Roman Catholic Clergyman may have acted from very different Motives from that. He may have had various other Motives to prevent him; and it is only Recollection of mine that he did not.

Have you any Reason to suppose that he did not give Religious Instruction in his own Chapel or elsewhere to Children attending the School?

I think I heard him say that there was a School more or less under his Patronage, where the Children were catechised in the Chapel, not the National School; and I think also, that, though I was right in saying he did not attend the National School to give Religious Instruction, to the best of my Recollection he stated that the Catholic Children in the School attended with the others and got Religious Instruction in the Chapel: but that is a mere Recollection, for I have never seen the Report since I wrote it.

Do you know whether in Munster it has often happened that the Teachers of the Schools were also the Clerks of the Roman Catholic Priests?

I think it has happened so sometimes.

Were the Schools in a large Proportion of Munster under the Patronage and Direction of the Roman Catholic Priests?

They were.

Are many of the Schools in Munster situated in the Chapel-yards?

In Cork there are a good many such.

In Kerry?

Not so many in Kerry, for the Schools in Kerry are fewer, and we have built several there.

Do you recollect any Instances in the County of Kerry in which the Entrance to the School was only by going into the Chapel-yard, there being no separate Entrance from the public Road?

To the best of my Recollection there are some National Schools so situated, but I believe them to be very few.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Do you know the Female Dingle School?
I was in that School; that is a Nunnery School.

Were you able to get into that School without going into the Nunnery?
I always went through the Chapel-yard to the School.

You know the Tralee Schools, both Male and Female; could you get into those Schools without going through the Chapel-yard?
Not by any Way that I am acquainted with.

The Killarney School; could you get into that School without going through the Chapel-yard?
At the Killarney School I think there was a Passage direct from the Street.

The Middleton School, which is a Nunnery School; do you recollect the Form of that Building?
The School was a Two-story Building, forming a Kind of a Wing to the Nunnery. There was a Passage, I believe, from the School to the Nunnery, but in going in you did not go through any such Passage. There was an open Entrance from the Road.

Were there not Two gabled Wings to a central Building, which was also gabled?
There was a central Building, which I understood to be the Nunnery, and at a short Distance, but I think connected with it by a Passage, there was the Schoolhouse, the Gable of which, I think, was turned to the Road; and there was then, to the best of my Recollection, either being built or about to be built, a corresponding Wing, which I understood was for a Roman Catholic Chapel.

At the Time you were there was there a Cross surmounting each of the Three Gables?
I think I recollect such being the Case on one of them; I did not observe as to the others.

Did you inspect the School at Cahirsiveen in Kerry?
I did.

Previously to its being taken into connexion with the Board?
No; after.

Do you know any thing of the Discussions relating to the Aid granted by the Board to that School?
I am not acquainted with them; it was granted and paid before I was in the District.

Do you recollect the School of Boulenshere, in the Parish of Ballyheigh, in the County of Kerry?
I do.

That was built with Aid from the Board?
It was.

Had you ever any Conversation with the Proprietor of the Land upon which it was built, respecting that School, respecting the Title?
I had.

What was the Purport of the Conversation?
I understood him to say that he had no fixed Intention of removing the Schoolhouse from the Jurisdiction of the Board, but that he would not renew the Lease to the Individual holding the surrounding Farm, from which the Site of the School had not been ever excepted, and which Site constituted Part of the said Farm.

Do you recollect the School of Ferriter in the Parish of Dunoorling?
I do.

That was built by Aid from the Board?
It was.

Do you happen to know whether any Trust was created for the secure holding of the School?
I understand that both in that Instance and in the Instance of Boulenshere the

the Board, before they paid the Money, required a Bond to be entered into, promising the Forfeiture of a certain Amount of Money in the event of the School being removed from their Jurisdiction.

In the Case of Ferriter do you know whether the usual Trust Deed was executed?

I do not know whether the usual Trust was executed; but that is not in my Province.

Do you know whether there was a strong Doubt respecting the Title to the Ground upon which that School was built?

I do happen to know that; in fact it arose from the Circumstance of the Patron having changed the Site from one Side of the Road to another, as described to me. Aid was promised for a certain Site, and thinking it to be better he changed it to the other Side of the Road, and thereby put it upon Ground for which nobody, as I was informed, could give a Lease, it being a Kind of Commonage; and the Board refused the Grant. I did my best to get it paid upon the Execution of a Deed such as I have described.

Who were the Parties to that Deed?

I think the Roman Catholic Clergyman and the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese.

Were those the Parties for whom you negociated as those that were to enter into the Engagement?

I did not negociate for any Parties; I merely recommended that some such Deed should be procured and the Money paid, because I conceived it a very hard Case upon the Roman Catholic Clergyman, who, I think, acted in Simplicity.

Do you recollect going into the School of St. Mary's, Limerick?

I do.

That is a large School?

It is.

Do you recollect any Inscriptions on the Walls of that School?

I do; I recollect the Ten Commandments being painted, One over each Window in the School; all round it.

In what Form were those Ten Commandments exhibited?

So far as I am aware, in the Form adopted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Was what we Protestants consider the Second Commandment given in that Enumeration?

I cannot speak to that Particular, but I was impressed with the Idea that it was the Form held by the Roman Catholic Church, and different from what the Protestants hold; and I reported it as such under the Words "Roman Catholic Version."

In what Year?

I think both 1834 and 1835.

Did you speak of it at the Time as an Irregularity to the Manager of the School?

I did.

In 1835 did you find it repeated?

I found it there again in 1835.

Did you again report it?

I did.

Do you know whether that was afterwards altered by Direction of the Board?

I have never been there since, but I presume it has been altered by Orders of the Board.

Was this School situated in a Nunnery?

It was connected with a Nunnery.

Mr. T. J. Robertson.

Do you know whether there are any Protestant Children there?
I do not know; I think not.

The Patron was a Roman Catholic?
The Person that acted as Correspondent was a Roman Catholic Clergyman.

Who were the Teachers?
The Ladies of the Establishment assisted at the School, and there were Two paid Teachers, who were both Roman Catholics.

You say you visited some Schools that were not under the Board; did you see any in the County of Limerick? Were you at Newcastle?
I was at Newcastle.

Did you go to the School?
I did not; for there was a strong Feeling against the Board amongst some of the Members of the Church there, and I felt some Degree of Delicacy about going into the School; I was afraid they would look upon it as an Intrusion.

Do you know any thing of the Nature of the School?
From what I have heard I suppose it to be a very good School; I saw it externally; it is a very fine looking House.

Do you know whether the Roman Catholic Holidays are kept generally in the National Schools of Munster?
I believe in the Schools that are under the Roman Catholic Clergy the Holidays which are called Holidays of Obligation are kept.

Are there Holidays kept also by Protestants and Catholics in giving up their Work on those Days?
Those that we call Holidays are kept; but there are certain Holidays of Obligation, on which they are obliged to attend Mass, and those are kept by Roman Catholics only.

And not by Protestants?
Some of those Days happen to be considered Holidays in our Church.

Are you aware that the Assumption of the Virgin Mary is one of those Days?
I cannot say any thing about the Particulars of those Days, for I do not know them.

Have you found those specified in the Rules of the School as Days of Vacation?
Very seldom; because the Rules specified a Week at Christmas, and so many Days at Easter, and those single Days are very seldom mentioned.

Have you ever had any Opportunity of observing Hedge Schools?
I have, in the County of Leitrim.

What Sort of Publications or Books have you found in use in them?
Generally speaking I should say they were not improper Books, though not good Books for Education. The Books generally were the Universal Spelling Book, Manson's Primer, and Reading Made Easy.

Inferior Books to those employed in the National Schools?
Far inferior.

Are you aware of any Instances in which Complaints have been made of Protestant Gentlemen refusing to give Land or let Land for the Purpose of erecting Schools under the National Board?
I am. More than One Catholic Clergyman who wished to get Schools under the Board has stated to me a positive Refusal on the Part of the Landlords to give him any Land. In One Instance a Roman Catholic Clergyman told me that the Landlord offered him a Site, and told him he might put it under what System he chose, provided he did not put it under the National System. But I do not state that of my own Knowledge; it was only told me.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The

The Rev. ROBERT BELL is called in, and examined as follows:

Where do you reside?
At Clonmel, in the County of Tipperary.

Have you had much Experience in the Education of the Poor in Ireland?
Since I have been a Parochial Minister I have.

You are a Parochial Minister?
I am Curate of Clonmel.

Have you had much Experience there, and in its Neighbourhood, in the Education of the Poor?
I should say I have.

Are you connected with any Societies for the Education of the Poor?
No.

Have you attended specially to the National Schools in the County of Tipperary?
I have visited several.

Can you say how many?
I think Thirteen in the County of Tipperary.

Any out of the County of Tipperary?
Some in the County of Waterford.

At what Places in Tipperary?
I visited the Two Schools of Cashel, the School of Carrick-on-Suir, the Two Schools of Kilcash, the Two Schools of Temple-etny, Rosegreen, Cloneen, Killusty, Newtown, and the Two Schools at Caher.

How many in Waterford?
In Waterford, I visited the School of Dungarvan, Two Schools of Tallow, the Two Schools of Lismore—that is I went to see the last Two, but there happened to be no School the Day I went; the School at Cappoquin, a School at Waterford, a School in Glenpatrick, and Thackincor School, which has since been given up.

How many in all?
Nine, and Two Schools in the County of Cork,—the Schools of Mitchelstown.

Did you direct your Attention specially to this Point, whether these National Schools have failed or succeeded in giving united Education to Protestants and Roman Catholics?
I did.

What was the general Result?
The general Result was that it had decidedly failed.

Were there many Schools in which there were absolutely no Protestants?
Yes; there were no Protestants in Nineteen of those Schools which I visited.

In Caher were there any?
There were none.

Are there two National Schools in Caher?
There are.

What are the Proportions between Roman Catholics and Protestants in Caher?
I cannot state.

Is not the Number of Roman Catholics, as compared with Protestants, very large?
It is.

There are a few Protestants there?
There are about Three hundred; there is a School which is frequented by the Protestant Children.

Rev. Robert Bell.

Is that School sufficient for the poor Protestant Population there?
Yes.

Will you mention the next School where there were no Protestants?
The next upon my List is Carrick-on-Suir.

What Sort of Proportion is there between the Catholics and Protestants there?
Very few Protestants,—perhaps about Three hundred.

Are there many poor Protestants there?
I am not aware.

You are not aware that there are not?
No. There is another School I think in Carrick, under the Superintendence of the Vicar of the Parish.

Do you believe that is large enough for the Protestant Poor there?
I believe so.

What is the next where there are no Protestants?
Cashel.

Do you know whether there is any Protestant School there?
There is.

Do you think the Protestant School there is sufficient for the poor Protestant Population?
I believe it is.

You are not sure?
No.

In what Character did you visit these Schools, voluntarily or being employed to do so?
Voluntarily.

Did you visit the Schools more than once, each of them, or only once?
I visited them generally only once.

You mentioned Two Schools which were visited by you that were not open at the Time?
Yes; the Schools of Lismore.

Then you did not see any thing of them?
No.

In your Visit did the Schoolmasters generally know who you were?
I am not aware that they did.

Did you ever find any Opposition on the Part of the Schoolmasters to give you all the Information you desired?
No.

Do you believe that generally in the other Places you have mentioned where there are National Schools there are Protestant Schools in the same Places?
There are Protestant Schools in Caher, (I now speak of the County of Tipperary,) in Carrick-on-Suir, and in Cashel; the others are principally Country Schools, those are in Towns. Some of those very Schools had previously been under other Societies.

In those Country Places are there any Protestant Schools?
I should think not in the same Parish.

Do you think there are any poor Protestant Parishioners in those Parishes?
There must be.

Which of those Places can you point out as having poor Protestant Children in them?
There cannot be many in the mere Country Parishes in the Part of the County of Tipperary where I visited; there must be very few.

In

In those Parishes are there Protestant Clergymen resident?
Yes, generally.

Have those Gentlemen in general set their Faces against the National System of Education?
They have.

Do the local Situation and Appearance of many of the National Schools identify them with belonging to One special Religious Denomination?
I should say the Situation of many of them did.

Will you mention any Instances?
The School of Carrick-on-Suir is in a Nunnery, the Schools of Caher are adjoining the Roman Catholic Chapel, the Schools of Cloneen and Killusty are in the Chapel Yard, and the Cashel Female School is in a Nunnery.

When you say adjoining the Roman Catholic Chapel you do not mean that the Entrance is the same, but you mean merely in point of Contiguity?
Yes.

What Schools are there in the County of Waterford that are so circumstanced?
Tallow Female School is in a Nunnery; Tallow Male School is close to the Roman Catholic Chapel, just at the opposite Side of the Street, built to correspond with the Roman Catholic Almshouses of the Parish.

Are there any others?
The Schools of Mitchelstown, which is in the County of Cork, are in the old Chapel.

What do you mean by the old Chapel?
It is not used as a Chapel now.

What others are there?
The School of Dungarvan adjoins the Roman Catholic Chapel, it is close to it, and I believe known for many Years to belong to the Order of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

Is it under their Direction?
Yes; as was also One of the Schools of Waterford that I visited.

Are there any others?
I do not think there are any others that I visited so circumstanced.

Do you consider that the Circumstance of the Locality being near the Chapel would prevent any Protestants attending those Schools if there were no other Circumstances that induced them not to do it?
I should say that with respect to some it would.

Why to some and not to others?
Those which are in Nunneries appear to me entirely to exclude Protestants.

But their being adjacent to a Chapel or being in an old Chapel, such Circumstances as those would not prevent Protestants attending the Schools if there were no other Circumstances to prevent them?
I think they might not.

Do you think the Circumstance of the School being built like the Roman Catholic Almshouses would prevent Protestants attending it?
I do not mean to say that if it were perfectly unobjectionable in other respects that would prevent them; but it seems to give a Character to the School.

That is one of the Ingredients which you think would be likely, being mixed with other Things, to operate upon People's Minds?
I should say decidedly.

Do you know what is the Religion of the Teachers of the Schools you visited?
They are Roman Catholics with one Exception, the School of Newtown.

Rev. Robert Bell.

Do you know under whose Patronage the School of Newtown is?
That is under the Patronage of Lady Osborne.

That is a School distinguished for its good Order?
It is very much so; it seems to be an excellent School.

Is Lady Osborne a Protestant?
She is a Protestant.

Are there many Protestant Children attending the School?
Six.

How many Roman Catholic Children are there attending the School?
I was informed there were 190 on the Roll.

Did you understand that Lady Osborne had much of the Management of it herself?
I rather think it is altogether under her Management.

Does the Roman Catholic Priest mix much in the Management of it?
I understood from the Master that he scarcely ever went there.

And that the Thing was altogether in the Hands of Lady Osborne?
Yes.

Does the Protestant Clergyman interest himself about that School?
The Protestant Clergyman has visited it occasionally; but I am aware that he does not approve of the National System.

Did he visit it to give Instruction to the Children?
I believe he sometimes goes during School Hours and takes a Class, but takes other Opportunities of giving peculiar Religious Instruction to the Protestant Children.

With that Exception all the Masters and Mistresses of the Schools to which you went were Roman Catholics?
They were.

Did you inquire into the Mode in which the School at Newtown was conducted; whether the Regulations of the Board were strictly observed there?
I believe they are.

Have you visited it often?
No; but once.

Did you inquire whether out of the School Hours Religious Instruction was attended to?
Yes; I know there is a good deal of Religious Instruction given by the Master and Mistress.

Under the Direction of Lady Osborne?
Yes.

How do you know that?
Because I have known the Master and Mistress for a considerable Time.

How near do you live to that School?
About Two Miles.

How often have you visited it?
I have visited it but once.

When was that?
It was about the Middle of April.

Did you visit those others somewhere about the same Time?
Some of them earlier.

You took a Sort of Tour of Inspection?
Yes.

Was that merely for the Gratification of your own Curiosity?
I was anxious to see the working of the Schools.

Rev. Robert Bell.

Was that your only Motive for taking this Tour of Inspection?
That was my Motive.

Were not you desired to do it by the Bishop of Exeter?
Yes, I was requested; not directly.

Though the Bishop of Exeter did not himself correspond with you, did you understand that the Information you were obtaining would go to the Bishop of Exeter?
Yes.

And it was for the Purpose of giving Information to the Bishop of Exeter that you made this Tour of Inspection?
Yes.

Did you ascertain whether the Scriptures were read by the Roman Catholic Children out of School Hours?
No.

How often did you visit each of those Schools you have mentioned?
Generally only once.

How long did you remain, upon an Average, in each School?
I should say generally about an Hour and a Half.

Are there any that you visited more than once?
I visited the Schools of Temple-etny and of Dungarvan more than once.

What was the Extent of your Tour?
It was in different Directions, and it was not all at the same Time.

How many Miles?
I cannot say from Memory, but shall give your Lordship the exact Number.

How many Days did it take you?
I visited it at different Times and in different Directions.

Did you ascertain, either from Entries in the Books or from any other Source of Information, whether the Holidays peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church were kept in those National Schools?
Yes; almost universally.

Can you state what those Holidays are?
The Assumption of the Virgin Mary, on the 15th of August, Corpus Christi, St. Peter and Paul's Day, and Patrick's Day are the principal ones.

Patrick's Day is a universal Holiday in Ireland, is it not?
Very generally kept as a Holiday.

Are not the Days you have mentioned the usual Holidays on which neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics work in Tipperary?
I am not aware that Protestants cease working on the Assumption, and Corpus Christi.

Are not you aware that Protestants as well as Roman Catholics cease working when there is no Work going on?
When they are not employed they cannot work.

Are you aware that Protestants observe those Holidays?
I am not.

Are you aware that Protestants do not observe those Holidays?
I am aware that they do not; I know that they are not reckoned Holidays among Protestants.

If they are in the Course of Employment with the Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholics keep those Holidays and do not work, do the Protestants go to work upon those Days?
Whenever they are employed I believe they would.

You mean that they do not object to it?
They do not object to it.

Rev. Robert Bell.

But is it their Habit?
I believe it is their Habit.

They would be glad to get Work upon those Days?
Certainly.

Did you ever employ Labourers yourself?
No.

Then you do not know from your own Experience?
No.

Do not you see, living in Clonmel, that Work ceases on those Days?
I am quite sure that I know that Protestants would work and do work on those Days.

Do you know any Case where they have worked on those Days?
I cannot pretend to say.

Do you know, as to the Case of any One Man who is a Labourer, whether he worked or not upon a certain Day?
No, I do not.

You know that they do not work much upon Patrick's Day?
I have said that Patrick's Day is a very generally observed Holiday.

And the others are as generally not observed as Holidays?
I should say so.

Is there any thing in the National Schools, from their being under the Direction of any particular Persons, that gives a Roman Catholic Character to the Schools?
I should say that the Circumstance of Schools being in Convents gives a very decided Roman Catholic Character to the Schools.

Have you found that the Schools you have visited were generally either under the Control of Convents or Monasteries or of any other Bodies or Individuals who would be likely to give a Roman Catholic Character to those Schools?
I found that in every Instance but Newtown they were either in Monasteries or Convents, or the Parish Priest was the Patron of the School.

You visited the Convent School at Carrick-on-Suir?
I did.

What did you see there?
I entered the School, and found several of the Ladies of the Convent employed in teaching, and upon entering into Conversation with one of them, I inquired as to the Nature and Conduct of the School. I found that there was no School-mistress; that the Nuns were the only Teachers; and I was shown the Order of Business of the School. I found that in that Order of Business there were during School Hours Two Opportunities for saying the Catechism, and that the School opened and closed with Prayer, and that before it was closed there was what was called a Spiritual Lecture delivered. I was further informed that at certain Times there was an interesting Ceremony in the School, for that the Children appeared dressed in their best Clothes, and that in a certain Part of the Room one of the Priests heard the Confessions of the Children, and gave them Tickets, upon which Tickets they were received to the Communion, and that an Altar was erected in another Corner of the Room, where the Children brought their Tickets, and received the Communion, Mass having been celebrated.

Who informed you of that?
One of the Nuns who was teaching there.

Were the Nuns in their Habits as Nuns?
Yes.

Were there any Protestant Children attending that School?
No.

Did you observe yourself any of those Ceremonies going on?
No; I understood that it took place but twice a Year.

On what Day of the Week?
I do not know.

It may have been on Sunday?
It may have been on Sunday.

Were you told it was on Sunday?
No.

Was there any thing said to you which would have induced you to suppose it was on Sunday?
No; from the Manner in which it was told me, I should imagine that it was a Holiday for the Occasion.

That it was an ordinary School-day made into a Holiday for the Purpose?
I should have thought so.

Might it not have been on the Day of separate Religious Education set apart in each Week?
It might.

Do you think it probable that it was?
I cannot form an Opinion.

Might it not have been upon One of those Holidays you have spoken of?
I cannot say.

Did you understand that the Performance of Divine Service in the School-room was at variance or not with the Rules of the Board?
I should have thought it was.

Did you give Information to the Commissioners that any such Violation of the Rules was going on?
No.

Why did you not?
I was aware that the Attention of the Commissioners had been specially called to the Subject of Convent Schools, and I should have thought they would have ascertained, through their Inspectors, the Circumstances of the different Schools in Convents.

Were you aware how often the Inspectors visited; as you supposed it necessary that the Inspector must have known of this, which took place twice a-year?
No; I am not aware of that.

Did you feel yourself authorized in concluding that this must have come to the Knowledge of the Inspector when it took place twice a-year only?
I did not say that it must have come to his Knowledge.

But your Reason for not mentioning it to the Commissioners was that you took for granted that they must have been aware of it?
No; I did not mean to convey the Impression that the Commissioners must have been aware that this was done.

Then why did not you give any Information? Had you any Reason to apprehend that Information respecting any Violation of their Rules would be ill received by them?
No.

Then what Reason had you for not making the Communication to them?
I cannot say that I felt any Disposition to enter into Communication with the Board upon the Subject.

You were not friendly to the Board?
I was not friendly.

Did you consider that because you were not friendly to the Board you were not to give any Information to them that might be useful to the Public, or be the Means of correcting any Abuses you had observed?
I thought there seemed to be Abuses upon every Hand.

Rev. Robert Bell.

And that was your Reason for mentioning none of them?
Certainly I mentioned none of them to the Board.

Owing to the great Number you had seen?
Owing to the great Notoriety of the Subject I did not think it necessary to put myself into the Situation of communicating with the Board.

Do you know of any Instance in which any Abuse in any of the Schools that have fallen under your Observation has been reported to the Board and not noticed by them?
I am not aware of any.

Did you write down your Name in the Book that is kept in every School?
No.

Why did you not?
I should have felt it my Duty to have expressed my Disapprobation of the entire System wherever I went, and I thought it would be rather out of Place to have done so.

Are you not aware that Books are kept for the Purpose of enabling Persons to enter their Observations?
I was not aware for occasional Visitors.

Do you mean to say that you refused to write down any Observations in any Book in any One of the Schools that you visited?
I was only asked in Two Places. I should have made rather a favourable Report of those Two Schools; but I should have done it in connexion with a general Disapproval of the System, and I thought it better not to enter my Name at all.

Do not you as a Clergyman, when you visit a School, if you see any thing that is likely to do any Harm to the Religion of which you are a Minister, think it your Duty to put those Observations down in a Book, that those Observations may be seen by those who may correct the Abuses?
Not in what I conceive to be an exclusively Roman Catholic School.

Were you aware or were you not that the Book would be seen by the Inspector at his next Visit?
I cannot say that it entered into my Contemplation.

Your Motive for not writing down your Observations was not that you might bring forward this Case to this Committee?
I mentioned the Circumstance in various Places.

In what Places did you mention it?
To several Persons. One of the first Persons I mentioned it to was the Vicar of the Parish.

Was it through the Intervention of the Vicar of the Parish that the Bishop of Exeter employed you to inspect those Schools?
No.

Did you mention it to the Gentleman, whoever it was, who was the Person who conveyed to you the Wish of the Bishop of Exeter to inspect those Schools?
Yes.

Who was that Gentleman?
That was my Father.

Did you draw up a written Report of your Inspection of all those Schools?
I did.

Did you transmit that to the Bishop of Exeter?
I did.

Then it was for the Purpose that those Abuses might be discussed either here or in a Speech in the House of Lords, and that they might not be corrected by the Commissioners themselves, that you refrained from reporting them to the Commissioners but you reported them to the Bishop of Exeter?
Some of them I did not know whether the Commissioners would consider

Abuses, and I certainly felt no Disposition whatever, I confess, to enter into Communication with the Board upon the Subject of the Schools.

What Facts are you acquainted with upon which you form the Opinion that the Commissioners would not consider as Abuses the Circumstances that you have stated?
I did not say that they would not consider as Abuses the Circumstances I have mentioned.

Then some of the Things you have stated you think they would consider as Abuses?
I think they would consider some of the Circumstances at Carrick-on-Suir as Abuses.

Then why did you not state that to the Board?
I have already given the Reason.

In point of fact you had no Wish that those Abuses should be remedied?
I cannot say that.

What was your Object in visiting these Schools; was it to see their actual State?
To see their actual State.

Did you feel yourself called upon to suggest any Remedy to them?
Certainly not.

Did not you feel that that was the Duty of those Inspectors who have to go round to the Schools?
Certainly.

Have you ever been requested by any Person connected with the Board to suggest to them what Abuses existed?
No.

When you visited a School you conceived yourself entitled to exercise your own Judgment as to whether you would write your Name in the Book?
Certainly.

If you had written your Name in the Book or made any Remarks, should you have thought that that was the best Way to procure the Rectification of an Abuse?
No, I should not.

Did you know at the Time you visited those Schools of the Appointment of this Committee?
No; I visited several previously.

But you visited others afterwards?
I did.

But you had commenced this Course of Visitation before you heard of the Appointment of any Committee?
Yes, I had.

But you had not done so before you heard of the Thing being mooted in Parliament?
No; all my Visits were subsequent to the last Session.

Having in your Mind a Desire for the Correction of those Abuses, did you think a Discussion in Parliament or a Parliamentary Inquiry was likely to lead to that Result?
I did.

Did you think it would lead to that Result more rapidly than a Correction ensuing upon the Abuse being made known to the Commissioners and corrected by them?
I thought it likely that the entire Conduct of the Schools would come under the Consideration of some Committee of Parliament, although that single Abuse might have been corrected more speedily.

Rev. Robert Bell.

But you did not seek the intermediate Correction of any thing which you considered as an Abuse previous to the Termination of a Parliamentary Inquiry upon the Subject?
I do not mean to say so.

But you took no Steps to get that intermediate Correction?
No.

Did you, looking at this as a corrupt and mischievous System, think it upon the whole the most expedient Way, in order to get this System exposed in its proper Colours, to collect those Facts as they were, and to give them to some Individual who would be likely to bring them before Parliament?
I did.

Do you consider the System to be a corrupt System?
I do.

Will you state the Grounds upon which you consider it to be a corrupt System?
I consider that the System has been founded upon an evil Principle. As an Individual, and a very humble one, I could never consent to a System upon the Foundation and the Principles of the National System, and therefore I confess I do not feel very anxious that the present System should be improved in some respects when I object to it in toto.

Do you mean by a "corrupt System" a System which does not meet your Approbation?
I did not use the Word "corrupt," I only adopted it.

The Question was put to you whether you considered it a corrupt System; you stated that you did consider it a corrupt System; and you are asked to state the Grounds upon which you consider it a corrupt System?
I do not presume to pronounce it to be corrupt merely because it does not suit my Views, but of course I can only speak of what my own individual Feeling upon the Subject is.

When you stated that you considered it to be corrupt you implied that you had Reason for so considering it. What is your Reason beyond the Opinion which you entertain of its not being a good System?
The Ground upon which I formed the Opinion is that it has proceeded upon the Expulsion of God's Word from the Schools.

What do you mean by the "Expulsion of God's Word"?
I understand that the general and free Use of the Word of God in the Schools was considered to be a vital Defect. I understand that the System has been established in concurrence with that View. I consider, as an Individual, that the Presence of God's Word is vitally essential to its being a good System, and therefore I cannot but look upon the present as a corrupt one.

You said "the free Use of God's Word;" what do you mean by "the free use of God's Word"?
I mean that it should be used by all the Children in the School.

Do you mean by "the free Use of God's Word" constantly, or whenever they please to use it? Do you mean that the Children should be at liberty to use the Word of God at their Option in the School?
No; I mean that it should be imperative.

At a certain Time every Day?
Yes.

Then you state that any System is corrupt, in your Opinion, that does not imperatively demand the reading of the Scriptures every Day in the School?
Yes.

For any particular Length of Time?
No, I cannot specify the Time.

How short a Time would satisfy you?
I mean that every Child capable of reading should read at least One Lesson every Day, and have it explained.

Is that done in any Schools that you know of?
Yes, it is done in the Schools with which I am myself connected.

What Schools are those?
They are Parochial Schools.

Do you give yourself the Religious Instruction in those Schools?
I do occasionally.

Are you the Person who explains the Chapter every Day?
Not every Day.

Who does explain the Chapter every Day?
The Teachers of the School.

What Class of Persons are those Teachers?
I can say that they are very respectable Persons in their Situation.

What Salary have they?
The Mistress of the Female School has 21*l.* a Year, and Apartments.

And she explains a Chapter to the Scholars every Day, does she?
Yes. But it is right that I should say that those Schools are completely under our own Superintendence.

Was that the Practice in the Kildare Place Schools?
I believe the Teachers were not at liberty to go very deeply into Explanation.

Did they go at all into Explanation?
I never was connected with the Kildare Place Schools.

Did you disapprove of the Kildare Place System?
It never went far enough for me, I candidly avow.

What do you mean by "far enough"?
It did not give sufficient Scriptural Instruction for my Mind.

Are there any Roman Catholic Children in those Schools of yours?
There are a few in the Female School.

Do those Roman Catholic Scholars come with the Knowledge of their Parents to have a Chapter in the Bible every Day explained to them by the Protestant Teacher?
They do.

Are their Parents aware of that Circumstance?
They are.

You have been asked what you meant by the Word "corrupt" as applied to the National System of Education; would you think that System to be corrupt which, professing to be National, appeared to you in its Operation to be partial, and practically to afford Funds mainly to One Description of Religionists?
The Way in which I would use the Word,—which, however, is a strong Expression and may be misunderstood as imputing improper Motives,—is in reference to the fundamental Rule of the Exclusion of the Scriptures during School Hours. The System, I think, is in its Management through the Country corrupt; but in a different Sense perhaps I should not have used the Word if it had not been given to me.

You mentioned the School at Carrick-on-Suir, in which Prayers were read at the Beginning of the School and at the End of the School every Day?
So I understood.

Can you inform the Committee what the Prayers were?
No, I cannot.

Did not you inquire into that?
No, I did not.

Rev. Robert Bell.

Should you consider a School in which the Protestant Clergyman attended for One Hour in the course of every Day for the Purpose of reading the Scriptures and expounding them to Protestant Children as a School from which God's Word was excluded?

I should say that that was a School from which God's Word was excluded where it could not be admitted during School Hours, and where there was a certain Class of Children into whose Hands it might not be put.

Do you consider that an entire Exclusion of the Scriptures?

I think it is an Exclusion.

An entire Exclusion?

I feel at a Loss to answer that Question. It is not an entire Exclusion if they be read during the Hours of the School, but if not within the Hours of the School I should say that the Scriptures are excluded from the School.

Then if it was read during an Hour, which Hour was called a School Hour, you would not consider that the Scriptures were excluded from that School?

Just so.

If it was read during an Hour which was not called a School Hour, but still equally read, you then would consider that an Exclusion?

Certainly an Exclusion from the School. I can only consider the School as existing during School Hours.

Supposing the Rule of the School to be, that at a certain Period for a certain Number of Hours the Children should be required to attend, and that during that Time of compulsory Attendance the Bible was excluded, and that an Hour was appointed, either before or after those Hours, when the Children might attend or not, and a Person might come or not to read the Bible to them or with them, should you say practically that the Bible was excluded from that School?

I should say it was.

If there was a School in which it was strictly forbidden that a certain Portion of the Children should have the Use of the Scriptures, should you think that the Bible was excluded from that School?

It is my Opinion that if there be a Restriction of that Kind the Bible is excluded.

Do you think that a System which has such an Exclusion can be a correct and proper System?

I do not.

Supposing there was a School in which it was laid down that during School Hours the History of England should not be read, but that the Children might remain an Hour after or might come an Hour before and read the History of England, should you say that the History of England was entirely excluded from that School?

I should say the History of England was excluded from that School.

Where were you educated yourself?

I was educated by my Father.

Not at a public School?

It is a public School, an endowed School.

In School Hours were you in the habit of reading the Bible?

Yes; not every Day.

At any particular Time, or at any Time indifferently?

We generally had a fixed Time.

When was it; was it in the Beginning, the first Thing in the Morning, or the last Thing in the Afternoon, or in the Middle of the School Exercises?

The Arrangement was not always the same.

When was it in general?

Just as it happened to be. My Father has generally been in the habit of making an Arrangement every Six Months.

During

During the last Six Months you were there, at what Time of the Day was it that the Bible was read?

I cannot undertake to say; it is many Years since I was at School; but I should say generally in the Middle of the Day.

And then all other School Exercises were intermitted?

No, there were generally so many Classes taken at a Time; and other School Exercises went on at the same Time in a different Place.

Was it Part of the Education that you should attend public Divine Service at stated Periods, or public Worship in the School?

Public Worship in the School certainly.

Were there any Roman Catholics in your Father's School?

At different Times.

Were they required to attend those Religious Exercises?

They attended Prayer; they were not required to attend the Reading and Explanation of the Bible.

The reading of the Bible took place generally you say in the Middle of the Day, and then the Roman Catholic Scholars were not required to attend?

No.

It was imperative upon the others?

It was.

You did not consider the Word of God as being excluded from that School?

No, I did not; but I consider a private School and a private Arrangement as upon a different Footing from a National System of Instruction.

Then you think that that would be a total Exclusion from a School that was under a National System which might not be called a total Exclusion under a private Establishment?

I should say that that might be admitted in a private Establishment which was not admissible in a National one.

Then you think it less objectionable to exclude the Scriptures from a private Establishment than from a National Establishment?

I do; I think they are upon a totally different Footing.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Two o'Clock.